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### 1NC – UQ

#### Clinton wins now, but margins are razor-thin – especially in swing states

Easley 6/28 – (Jonathan Easley is a reporter covering the election for The Hill, 6/28/16, “Polls show tight Clinton-Trump race in 2016 battlegrounds,” *The Hill*, <http://thehill.com/homenews/campaign/285083-polls-show-tight-race-for-white-house-in-battleground-states>, Accessed 7/7/16, HWilson)

Battleground state polls show Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton locked in a tight race for the White House with just more than four months to go before Election Day.

Clinton has so far failed to pull away in the 10 states likely to determine the outcome of the 2016 election, even as Trump has suffered through what some political observers describe as the worst stretch they’ve seen a major presidential candidate endure.

Trump in the last few weeks has fired his campaign manager, seen Republicans flee from his campaign and released embarrassingly low fundraising figures.

Yet he is running competitively with Clinton in the states that will decide the winner of the White House after what may be looked back on as the low point of his campaign.

“If we’ve learned anything this cycle, it’s that this is the Donald Trump election and none of the normal rules apply,” Monmouth University pollster Patrick Murray told The Hill.

President Obama coasted to reelection in 2012 by defeating GOP nominee Mitt Romney in nine out of 10 battleground states: Colorado, Florida, Iowa, Nevada, New Hampshire, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia and Wisconsin.

He lost North Carolina, which he had won four years earlier.

Heading into the 2016 conventions next month, polls in those 10 states show close races across the board.

The polling suggests Clinton has an edge because she has leads in six of the 10 states, while Trump is only consistently leading in North Carolina.

Clinton’s lead, however, is just a percentage point or two in most of the states.

Clinton’s largest lead is in Wisconsin, a state Democrats haven’t lost in a presidential election since 1984. According to a CBS News-YouGov poll released Sunday, she has a 5-point lead in the Badger State.

In every other state, the candidates are either tied or within 3.5 points of one another.

Trump and Clinton both have historically high unfavorable ratings, opening the door for two outsider candidates — Libertarian Party nominee Gary Johnson and Green Party candidate Jill Stein — to potentially play spoiler.

When Johnson and Stein are considered in polls, the margin between Clinton and Trump almost invariably narrows.

Overall, the electoral map appears to provide more avenues for Clinton to reach 270 electoral votes than Trump.

Polls suggest Clinton has a strong chance of winning Arizona, for example, and the race is also surprisingly close in Georgia and Utah.

RealClearPolitics has Clinton favored to win 211 electoral votes, including 10 from Wisconsin.

The website has Trump winning 164 but has him favored in none of the 10 battleground states.

States with 163 electoral votes are seen as toss-ups on the RCP map, including the nine other traditional battlegrounds as well as Arizona, Georgia and Michigan, which has been a safe Democratic state.

Democrats insist they are not taking anything for granted in the race.

“No Democrat with any common sense or real campaign experience is taking this race for granted,” said Democratic strategist Craig Varoga. “These states are battlegrounds for a reason — they're always, without exception, closer in polls and results than the other 35 to 40 states.”

Pennsylvania is the battleground giving Democrats the most heartburn.

Its 20 electoral votes have not gone to the GOP nominee in almost 30 years, yet a Public Policy Polling survey of the state released this month found Trump and Clinton tied, while a Quinnipiac University poll showed Clinton ahead by only 1 point. Analysts at the University of Virginia’s Center for Politics recently shifted Pennsylvania from “Likely Democratic” to “Leans Democratic.”

Trump on Tuesday will look to build on his advantage with working class white voters in the state with a speech from Monessen, a steel mill town an hour south of Pittsburgh that is trying to revitalize itself.

Clinton’s allies, meanwhile, are now pouring millions of dollars into a state where they never expected to have to compete.

The contest in New Hampshire, which has gone for the Democratic candidate in five of the last six presidential cycles, is also a toss-up, with the latest poll showing the candidates are tied.

Even Clinton’s 5-point lead in Wisconsin is emblematic of the challenges both candidates face: Sixty-one percent of voters said they have a negative view of Clinton, against 62 percent who view Trump unfavorably.

“The historically high unfavorability rating for both of these candidates and the overridingly negative attitude voters have about the direction of the country give an added level of volatility to this race that we haven’t seen,” said pollster David Winston. “We’re in uncharted waters. Clinton has a slight edge, but this is far from settled.”

Trump and Clinton are tied in Ohio, but Clinton holds a 3.4 point lead over Trump in Florida, according to the RCP average of polls.

Florida, by far the biggest swing state with 29 electoral votes, was won by Obama by less than 1 point in 2012.

Clinton has only a 1-point lead in Colorado, according to a CBS-YouGov poll released over the weekend. That poll found that a plurality of voters only support Clinton because they oppose Trump, and vice versa.

In Virginia, Clinton has a 42 to 39 lead over Trump, according to a recent PPP survey.

But again, there are warning signs here for the Democrat: Trump leads big, 42 to 29, among independent voters.

And that survey found that Clinton’s lead would be larger, but that supporters of Bernie Sanders have yet to get on board with her campaign.

The only state where Trump is presently favored to win is North Carolina, where he holds a 1.3-point advantage in the RCP average.

North Carolina is consistently one of the closest contests in the country. Obama notched the lone Democratic victory there in modern times, squeaking out a 0.3 percentage point victory in 2008, before falling short there by 2 points in 2012.

### 2NC – UQ – Swing States

#### Clinton barely leads in swing states – fears over globalization and American pride resonate with voters

Salvanto 6/26 – (Anthony Salvanto is CBS News elections director, 6/26/16, “Poll: Donald Trump, Hillary Clinton in tight races in battleground states,” *CBS News*, <http://www.cbsnews.com/news/poll-donald-trump-hillary-clinton-poll-florida-north-carolina-wisconsin-colorado-battleground-states/>, Accessed 7/5/16, HWilson)

Battleground states are called battlegrounds for a reason: They're often close, and 2016 looks like no exception.

Hillary Clinton holds narrow leads over Donald Trump across a number of key states of Florida (up three points, 44 to 41 percent); Colorado (Clinton 40 percent, Trump 39 percent); Wisconsin (Clinton up 41 percent to 36 percent) and North Carolina, which has flipped back and forth between the parties in the last two elections, where it's Clinton 44 percent and Trump 42 percent.

In the wake of the Brexit referendum in the United Kingdom this week, many wondered if the same sentiments that drove voters to leave the UK, such as voter unease about the economic and cultural effects of globalization, were at work in the U.S. presidential election, too.

Similar sentiments underpin Donald Trump's general election vote, though there is not yet enough for him to surpass Clinton. Trump is also competitive in large part because of partisanship, as rank-and file Republicans continue to get behind him, even as Republican leaders have been more lukewarm toward the way Trump is running his campaign.

About one-third of voters in these states feel the U.S. has done too much in trying to become part of the global economy; too much to make changes to its culture and values, and encouraged too much diversity of people from different backgrounds. Those sentiments are especially pronounced among Republicans and conservatives in these battleground states, majorities of whom feel that way. And those voters are overwhelmingly supporting Donald Trump over Hillary Clinton.

Partisanship is driving much of these horse races too. Despite the hard-fought primary contests on both sides, Democrats in these states are now lining up behind Hillary Clinton and Republicans behind Trump--each garnering around eight in ten from their respective camps.

And much of the vote appears locked in already: the bulk of those not voting for Clinton say they will not consider her, and the bulk of those not voting for Trump say they will not consider him. In Florida, sizable numbers of voters are voting in opposition to a candidate they don't like: Forty-eight percent of Trump's voters are backing him mainly to oppose Hillary Clinton, and 32 percent of Clinton's voters are with Clinton in order to oppose Trump. That opposition effect works for both candidates, but voters say each party may have lost opportunities. Fifty percent of those not backing Clinton say they might have considered a Democrat this year had the party not been selecting Clinton as its nominee, and 47 percent of those not for Trump say they might have considered a Republican, but won't support Trump.

Voters see many themes in this election, though partisans have very different views on which of them are the most important. Most feel the election is a lot about the safety and security of the country (in Florida, 74 percent say so, as do 70 percent in North Carolina) and most say it's also about what it means to be an American (59 percent say so in Florida) and about whether or not the economy works fairly (53 percent say so in Wisconsin, for example.) Trump voters and Republicans are more apt to say it's about what it means to be American, and also about changing Washington. Clinton voters in these states are less likely to say it's about changing Washington, and more apt to say this race is about making the economy work, and about security the rights of people who deserve them.

While some Republican leaders are at best lukewarm about how Trump is running his campaign, rank-and-file Republicans in these states are largely okay with it, and many don't care whether or not Trump listens to party leaders. This was an anti-establishment sentiment we saw repeatedly through the primary season, too. However for the larger electorate, and especially among independents, this campaign is leaving them a bit distant. Independents say that the Democrats nominating Clinton hasn't made them think better of the Democratic party, and that the Republicans nominating Trump hasn't made them think better of the Republicans.

#### Clinton wins now, but Trump could win if he captures swing states in the Rust Belt

Stokols 6/19 – (Eli Stokols is a national politics reporter for POLITICO, currently covering the Republican side of the 2016 presidential election, 6/19/16, “Donald Trump’s path to victory,” *Politico*, <http://www.politico.com/story/2016/06/donald-trump-path-to-victory-224239>, Accessed 7/5/16, HWilson)

Donald Trump has vowed to remake the electoral map by winning states that have been reliably blue in recent cycles — but the GOP’s best pollsters say his bluster is a long way from aligning with reality.

Trump, who has been slow to campaign in swing states while raising money by stumping in red states like Texas last week, should be able to count on winning Republican strongholds — states such as Arizona (11 Electoral College votes) and Georgia (16), where he campaigned last Wednesday, despite some optimism from Democrats that those increasingly diverse states could be put in play. In total, the party’s electoral math gurus say the presumptive GOP nominee likely starts the general election with a hold on 19 states, giving him a total of 164 Electoral College votes.

To reach 270, Trump’s team is aiming to capture America’s Rust Belt — specifically, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan and Wisconsin — where polls generally show him performing better than Mitt Romney did at this point in 2012. If he can capture Florida and keep North Carolina — the 2012 red state of the lightest hue — a strong showing that includes capture of the Rust Belt could, Trump’s team believes, put him over the top.

### 2NC – UQ – Rust Belt

#### Clinton has the lead, but Trump has momentum, especially in Rust Belt states

Hoddinott 6/8 – (Aaron, 6/8/16, “It’s On! Trump versus Clinton for Leader of Free World,” <http://capitalistcreations.com/its-on-trump-versus-clinton-for-leader-of-free-world/>, Accessed 7/7/16, HWilson)

History was apparently made last night, just don’t ask Bernie Sanders. Hillary Clinton won the Democrat nomination for President, making her the first woman to accomplish this in the history of America. So now the moment we’ve all been waiting for has arrived: From now ‘til November, she will be going toe to toe with Donald Trump. Both candidates are highly disliked by factions within their own parties, yet appeal to a growing base of undecided voters.

Trump Has the Edge Over Hillary

Although the critics of Trump say the electoral map strongly indicates a Hillary victory in November, momentum looks to be on Trump’s side. And for his personality, he has the right message to take back the Rust Belt from the Democrats, which would almost guarantee a victory for The Donald. Not only that, but if Hillary’s victory speech last night was any indication of the narrative she will go with against Trump during the election season, it will backfire on her.

From Hillary Clinton’s Victory Speech Last Night

Clinton explained to her revelers last night that her mom told her from a young age to never back down from a bully – insinuating of course that Trump is that bully. Hillary called her victory a historic moment for women, which hints that her campaign strategy will be to hit Trump on his so-called misogynist ways. Problem is, given her husband’s track record and her reported silencing tactics of his female critics, it will backfire. Some right-wing commentators have gone so far as to call Bill a sexual predator – fodder for Trump on the campaign trail.

As an aside, Hillary looks rather sickly. This is no reason to critique someone, and I hope she isn’t ill, but appearance matters on the campaign trail. Energy levels matter – as we saw with Jeb ( Trump routinely attacked the once front-runner for being “low energy”). Drudge has reported there is a real health issue with Hillary that is being kept quiet. Who knows…

Moreover, Trump will not let Clinton’s email server problem die. And nor should he. This should be of huge concern for the American voter. And if Hillary doesn’t win, it could be her Nixon moment. It’s likely ‘do or be prosecuted’ for Hillary this election. I suspect the investigators are too nervous to prosecute a potential future President… but if she doesn’t win, Hillary will likely be prosecuted. That dark cloud will not leave her the entire campaign – Trump will make sure of that.

In Trump’s victory speech last night he promised to make a big speech about ‘Clinton corruption’ and how they sold government access for money. The gloves are off, and I think Trump will come out of this scrum the victor. Hillary just has too many skeletons. As crazy as it is to say, Bernie Sanders would have been a tougher fight for Trump than Hillary Clinton. She’s a flawed candidate.

### 2NC – UQ – Polls

#### \*\*\*note when prepping file --- the evidence below answers uniqueness overwhelms arguments

#### Clinton has a slight lead, but it’s neck and neck – newest polls and Trump actions

Rappeport 6/29 – (Alan Rappeport is a writer and reporter covering the U.S. election for the New York Times, 6/29/16, “Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump Are Deadlocked, Poll Shows,” *New York Times*, <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/30/us/politics/hillary-clinton-and-donald-trump-are-deadlocked-poll-shows.html?_r=0>, Accessed 7/5/16, HWilson)

Hillary Clinton and Donald J. Trump are deadlocked less than a month before the Democratic and Republican presidential conventions, according to a new national poll of registered voters that shows the American electorate feeling disappointed in each candidate.

A Quinnipiac University survey released on Wednesday found that 42 percent supported Mrs. Clinton while 40 percent backed Mr. Trump. The poll represents a slight improvement for Mr. Trump, who trailed by four points at the beginning of the month, and has a margin of error of plus or minus two percentage points.

The numbers come as Mr. Trump has rebooted his campaign after a series of missteps, appointing a new campaign manager and sharpening his rapid- response operation. Mrs. Clinton has been aggressively taking on Mr. Trump with a series of speeches questioning his temperament and picking apart his policies.

#### Clinton wins, but Trump’s drawing closer

Sherfinski 7/5 – (David Sherfinski covers politics for The Washington Times, 7/5/16, “Donald Trump cuts into Hillary Clinton’s lead: poll,” *The Washington Times*, <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2016/jul/5/donald-trump-cuts-hillary-clintons-lead-poll/>, Accessed 7/5/16, HWilson)

Likely Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump has cut what had been a double-digit lead for Hillary Clinton two months ago down to single digits, according to a poll released Monday.

Mrs. Clinton led Mr. Trump by about 5 percentage points, 45.6 percent to 40.4 percent, according to the USA Today/Suffolk University poll. Rounding would give Mrs. Clinton a 6-point, 46 percent to 40 percent, lead.

That’s about in line with the lead Mrs. Clinton holds in an average of recent national polling. Two months ago, she had led Mr. Trump in the USA Today/Suffolk poll by 11 points, 50 percent to 39 percent.

In the new poll, 61 percent reported feeling alarmed about the election, compared to 23 percent who said they feel excited and 9 percent who said they feel bored.

Mrs. Clinton led among females voters by a 12-point, 50 percent to 38 percent, margin, while Mr. Trump led among men by 2 points, 43 percent to 41 percent.

More than nine in 10 Clinton supporters and more than nine in 10 Trump supporters said they’re firm in their choice.

But majorities still said they have an unfavorable opinion of both Mrs. Clinton (53 percent) and Mr. Trump (60 percent).

Six in 10 Trump supporters, 62 percent, said they think he will actually win the election, compared to 89 percent of Clinton supporters who said they think she will win.

In a four-way race, Mrs. Clinton held a 4-point lead over Mr. Trump, 39 percent to 35 percent, with Libertarian Party nominee Gary Johnson at 8 percent and Green Party candidate Jill Stein at 3 percent.

The national survey of 1,000 registered voters was taken from June 26-29 and has a margin of error of plus or minus 3 percentage points.

### 2NC – UQ – Obama Popularity

#### Clinton will win, but aligning with Obama is key

Karni 7/5 – (Annie Karni is a Politics Reporter for Politico, 7/5/16, “Obama and Clinton rally against Trump,” *Politico*, <http://www.politico.com/story/2016/07/obama-and-clinton-rally-against-trump-225086>, Accessed 7/5/16, HWilson)

When Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama publicly reconciled eight years ago at a celebrated summer rally in Unity, New Hampshire, the two recent rivals were still closer to being opponents than friends.

While both candidates were set on healing the Democratic Party after a divisive primary, the lead-up to the event was fraught. Did their show of warmth — a kiss on the tarmac in Washington, D.C., as they boarded a chartered plane together — appear genuine? Would their praise for each other — “she rocks,” gushed Obama, seeking to win over her supporters — seem too forced?

When President Obama takes the stage at the Charlotte Convention Center with Clinton on Tuesday afternoon for their first joint rally of the 2016 campaign, it will be most notable for how far the two leaders of the Democratic Party have come in the eight intervening years.

“It is as far from fraught as can be,” said Obama’s former chief strategist, David Axelrod, of Obama's long-anticipated campaign trail debut. “He’s been chomping at the bit to get out there. There’s so many reasons why he feels strongly about this — part of it is his genuine respect for her, part of it is his feelings about the alternative. There’s no half-hearted warrior here.”

Virginia Gov. Terry McAuliffe, a longtime Clinton confidant, said of Tuesday’s rally that unlike eight years ago, “they have such a great relationship that there’s nothing to psychoanalyze. He wants to do everything he can for her.”

Coming just weeks before Clinton is expected to announce her running mate, the Charlotte rally will also serve as a reminder that the Clinton-Obama alliance remains the Democratic Party’s defining partnership no matter whom Clinton chooses as her No. 2. The idea of the first female president following the first African-American president bonds the two leaders in their own minds and in the minds of their supporters, aides said. Some Democratic operatives with young children like to joke that their kids could be 16 before they realize a white man can serve as commander in chief.

McAuliffe, who has been pushing his home state Sen. Tim Kaine as Clinton’s running mate, outlined what Clinton is looking for in a partner on the trail. “I’ve known Hillary for 30 years — she wants someone who can be a collaborator,” he told POLITICO. “President Clinton and Al Gore used to have their weekly lunches. That’s ingrained in Hillary’s head as well. She wants a partner, she doesn’t want someone who’s going to upstage her. You want someone helping to push your agenda.”

But so far, it's the outgoing president, with his 52 percent approval rating, who fits that bill.

The risk is Donald Trump and other Republican detractors will seize on the rally as further evidence that Clinton is running for Obama’s third term. And on the heels of last week’s energetic rally with Massachusetts Sen. Elizabeth Warren, the two events could remind voters of how Clinton on her own remains a low-appeal candidate in need of star power to generate enthusiasm.

But Obama’s popularity among the Democratic voter blocs Clinton needs outweigh any potential drawbacks. On Tuesday, what will matter more than any close study of their body language, like eight years ago, is how the president posits his case for the woman he would like to see as his successor and safeguard of his legacy. Obama allies said they expect him to deliver a first-hand account of what kind of temperament the presidency requires. As a former rival who came around to Clinton, White House aides said, Obama can also make the most convincing case to voters who remain ambivalent about her. Clinton’s own willingness to serve under the rival she once viewed as an unqualified upstart also helps to cast her in a flattering light.

The image most ingrained in Axelrod’s mind of Clinton’s service in Obama’s Cabinet, for instance, is her reaction to the 2010 passage of the Affordable Care Act. “The day after it passed, she got up and she gave him a big hug,” he recalled, “she was hugging and high-fiving everyone in the Situation Room. She was so fundamentally excited that this had happened. It was a touching moment. What it said was there are bigger things than egos and ambitions.”

The rally Tuesday is also expected to represent a unique moment in the campaign: Obama and Clinton are not planning many joint appearances in the months to come. “They will be more apart than together,” said a White House official. “They can both draw crowds and energize and excite voters.”

The Charlotte rally also marks a break from modern presidential election history: It’s been more than half a century since a sitting president was called upon by a potential successor for help — and truly delivered.

With approval ratings in the 20s, George W. Bush was no asset to John McCain in 2008. And hot off Bill Clinton’s impeachment in 2000, “Clinton was a very mixed bag for Al Gore,” said Democratic strategist and former Gore adviser Robert Shrum. Gore kept his distance from Clinton, rarely even calling for the advice that the insulted outgoing president was desperate to give.

George H.W. Bush in 1988 needed to make a case beyond running as Ronald Reagan’s third term and needed some distance from the popular but aging president — Reagan’s best pitch for his vice president, at a rare joint rally in California, was that playing the role of standby equipment as a vice president was a role that didn’t “fit easily on such a man.”

In Richard Nixon’s 1960 race against John F. Kennedy, President Dwight D. Eisenhower’s assessment about his own vice president’s lack of experience — “If you give me a week I might think of one, I don’t remember,” he said, when asked to give an example of Nixon’s contribution to his administration — ended up in a negative ad run by the Kennedy campaign.

In contrast, Obama is the rare “unalloyed asset” for Clinton, said Shrum. “People who don’t like him are never going to vote for Hillary anyway,” he said. “There’s no downside at all. He mobilizes the base of the party; he’s got over 50 percent job approval. There’s no reason you wouldn’t use him as much as you can.”

“It’s a smart move for her, and it’s a smart move for the president,” said Roy Neel, a former adviser to Bill Clinton and Al Gore. “Obama can be extremely helpful to Hillary, certainly to rally African-American, Hispanic voters, and young people, the base that elected him in 2008.”

Originally planned for Green Bay, Wisconsin, the Clinton-Obama rally was rescheduled after the June 13 mass shooting in Orlando, and subsequently moved to the battleground state that Obama lost by a narrow margin in 2012 after having won it in 2008. The new location signals a Democratic effort to expand the map there in the wake of Trump’s recent weakness in North Carolina polls. Over the weekend, in a sign of the state’s increasing significance, Trump announced a competing rally in Raleigh the same day.

But this competing campaign stop might serve to fuel Obama’s case for Clinton.

“He can talk about what the presidency requires,” said Axelrod. “And the big argument she’s making is that she has the temperament and the experience that’s necessary for the job.”

#### Specifically in swing states – the Clinton-Obama team is key to swinging young voters that are key

Cahn 6/30 – (Emily Cahn is a senior writer for Mic covering politics, 6/30/16, “4 States Where Barack Obama Can Boost Hillary Clinton's Campaign,” *Policy Mic*, <https://mic.com/articles/147394/4-states-where-barack-obama-can-boost-hillary-clinton-s-campaign#.EL7qIPl9A>, Accessed 7/7/16, HWilson)

Democrats are fired up and ready to unleash President Barack Obama.

Obama will hit the campaign trail on Tuesday in Charlotte, North Carolina — his first joint-appearance with presumptive Democratic presidential nominee Hillary Clinton since he endorsed her earlier this month.

With his approval rating averaging more than 50% for the first time since early 2013, Democrats say Obama will be an asset to their party in the fall. And they are planning to lean on him to help Clinton win in November and cement his presidential legacy.

Yet while Democrats say Obama's popularity will be a boon in November, they add that there are certain places he's most likely to appear as Election Day draws near.

Look for Obama and Clinton to hit suburban areas in swing states. While places such as Arizona and Georgia — traditionally Red states where polls show Clinton within striking distance — might not benefit from a visit from Obama.

"I think that the president can and be an asset pretty much anywhere, but particularly with young people, particularly in swing states he's done well in, and particularly in some of the more suburban areas of these swing states," Shripal Shah, communications director for Senate Majority PAC, a super PAC working to flip the Senate back to Democratic control in November, said. "Those are the people that pretty much built his coalition in '08 and '12, and those are the people who are still persuadable. and he's the the best messenger to persuade them"

### 2NC – AT: UQ Overwhelms

#### It’s not a landslide – it’ll be close

Post and Courier 7/2 – (The Post and Courier editorial board; Charles R. Rowe is the editorial page editor, 7/2/16, “It’s not over till it’s over,” *The Post and Courier*, <http://www.postandcourier.com/20160702/160709844/its-not-over-till-its-over>, Accessed 7/5/16, HWilson)

An article in Tuesday’s New York Times entertained the seemingly growing possibility that Hillary Clinton could become the first “landslide” presidential-election winner in more than three decades. And recent polls do show her standing on the rise while Donald Trump’s falls.

But before assuming that the electoral rout is on, keep in mind that most analysts repeatedly — and inaccurately — dismissed Mr. Trump’s chances at winning the Republican White House nomination in his first bid for elective office.

Keep in mind, too, that while “The Donald” has extraordinarily high “negative” poll numbers, so does Mrs. Clinton.

Sure, as John Harwood wrote in his latest dispatch from the Times’ “Letter From America” series, Mr. Trump’s “tempestuous persona, harsh rhetoric and thin preparation have repelled important segments of his own Republican Party as well as Democratic constituencies.”

Plus, the Times’ new average of assorted polls reflects Mrs. Clinton’s upward trend this month, showing her with a 45 to 39 percent national edge. Last week’s Washington Post/ABC News poll, which gave her a 48-36 percent edge, also reported that nearly one-third of Republicans and GOP-leaning independents — and two-thirds of all voters surveyed — deemed Mr. Trump unqualified for the presidency.

Then again, a Quinnipaic University poll released Tuesday gauged Mrs. Clinton’s lead at a scant 42-40 percent. A Rasmussen survey released Thursday showed Mr. Trump ahead by 43-39 percent. And recent polls in the “battleground states” of Florida, Ohio and Pennsylvania remain relatively close.

Remember, too, that each of the last six presidential elections has been decided by about a dozen such swing states. The national tickets of one party or the other have consistently carried at least three dozen states — including South Carolina, which has now backed the GOP nominee in nine straight presidential contests.

The last presidential-race landslide came in 1984, when Ronald Reagan was re-elected while winning 49 states and 58.8 percent of the popular vote against Walter Mondale.

George H.W. Bush then carried 40 states and took 53.4 percent of the vote against Michael Dukakis in 1988.

However, since then, no candidate has topped the 32 states carried by Bill Clinton in 1992 or the 52.9 percent of the popular vote garnered by Barack Obama in 2008.

Yes, the latest betting odds peg Mrs. Clinton as a 11-to-4 favorite (you must bet $11 on her to collect $4 if she wins) and Mr. Trump as a 9-to-4 underdog (bet $4 on him to collect $9 if he wins).

Yet one year ago, the odds against Mr. Trump winning the Oval Office were much longer at 33-to-1.

Perhaps continued criticism by fellow Republicans, and Friday’s resignation of another high-ranking campaign official (“director of surrogates” Kevin Kellems) signal serious trouble for Mr. Trump.

Perhaps Mrs. Clinton will over time emerge as a lock to win the presidency.

Maybe she will even do so by a landslide, winning numerous red states in a politically transforming process.

But regardless of which nominee you consider the better — or less bad? — presidential pick, don’t bank on who will win, or by how much, before the poll that really counts.

And that’s the one tabulated on Nov. 8.

#### Brexit and Clinton failures mean the race will be tight and Trump is a serious threat

Fahy and Fahy 7/4 – (Brian Fahy and Garrett Fahy are practicing lawyers and talk radio hosts as well as contributing writers at the Orange County Register, 7/4/16, “Is Trump's election America's Brexit?,” <http://www.ocregister.com/articles/trump-721321-brexit-president.html>, Accessed 7/5/16, HWilson)

The impossible is becoming increasingly probable. In spite of his Twitter tirades, boorish behavior and propensity for prevarication, Donald Trump is, according to CBS News and Quinnipiac University polling, almost even with Hillary Clinton both nationally and in the must-win states of Florida, Colorado and North Carolina. How is this possible?

His polling rebound comes on the heels of his strong rhetorical takedown of Hillary Clinton and President Obama after the Orlando massacre and his support for the Brexit campaign, which sent an anti-establishment, anti-immigration message, a “Britain First” message, which stunned the British political establishment. Outgoing British Prime Minister David Cameron, the first Brexit casualty, suggested this week that the Brexit referendum was fueled in large part by British frustrations over unrestrained immigration. Sounds familiar.

On this side of the Atlantic, Trump has been pushing his “America First” theme, which, like the Brexit movement, disdains the political establishment and unchecked immigration of unscreened migrants from failed states. Whether the fervor that fueled the Brexit campaign will cross the pond is anyone’s guess, but events here are fueling Trump’s surging, anti-establishment campaign.

First, gun control. In the wake of the Orlando massacre, Democrats made themselves look foolish – and Trump look presidential – by staging a failed sit-in on the House floor and demanding a vote on proposals that even the ACLU opposed, whereby those on the secret no-fly list and terror watch list would be denied, without any due process, the constitutional right to own a gun. In contrast, Trump said he would be meeting with the NRA to “discuss how to ensure Americans have the means to protect themselves in this age of terror.”

Next, the Supreme Court. In the last week of its term, the Supreme Court deadlocked on President Obama’s unlawful attempt to rewrite our immigration laws, ensuring the president’s amnesty program is (thankfully) dead for now. Immigration will remain a campaign issue, and a winning issue for Trump, after Hillary promised similarly unlawful executive actions should she capture the White House. The Court also overturned Texas’ commonsense laws regulating abortion providers, reminding voters that the Supreme Court is out of control and in need of a president to appoint a conservative justice to stem the tide of liberal arrogance. Anyone on Trump’s announced short list will do.

Third, while Trump’s paltry fundraising has given political professionals heartburn, this hasn’t prevented Trump from getting his messages out. Even though he has raised less than most congressional candidates, his ability to get free media coverage is propelling his candidacy and ensuring that he leads every news cycle. Trump is doing now what President Reagan did so well 30 years ago: speaking directly to the American public and bypassing the New York/D.C. media machine.

Compounding his good luck, Hillary Clinton, the woman who amassed a fortune giving secret speeches to Wall Street executives and taking donations from foreign governments with deplorable human rights records, is giving ultra-liberal Massachusetts Senator Elizabeth Warren – the fake Native American – a test drive as a potential vice presidential nominee. Trump rejoices as two shrill, Northeastern liberals with credibility problems peddle an agenda more liberal than President Obama’s, and more than 60 percent of America believes the nation is on the wrong track.

Lastly, the Democratic National Committee this week doubled down on its war against blue-collar jobs by voting to endorse the Stalinesque investigation by Democratic attorneys general of energy companies and think tanks who dared to question the reality of global warming or climate change. The party that squandered billions on failed green energy schemes (e.g. Solyndra) is now targeting some of America’s largest and most influential employers on an issue that always ranks dead last on voters’ priority lists, a sure way to forfeit votes and campaign contributions.

Does all of this mean Trump will win come November? Not at all. But it does mean that the Trump train chugs on, building momentum and making it increasingly unlikely that the GOP establishment or Hillary Clinton will derail a movement no serious person believed could succeed – just like the Brexit referendum.

#### Even the Nate Silver concedes that a Clinton win isn’t inevitable

Silver et al., 6/30 – (Nate Silver is the founder and editor in chief of FiveThirtyEight, Harry Enten is a senior political writer and analyst for FiveThirtyEight, Clare Malone is a senior political writer for FiveThirtyEight, David Firestone, formerly a reporter and editor at The New York Times, is FiveThirtyEight’s managing editor; 6/30/16, “An 80 Percent Shot Doesn’t Mean Clinton Is A Sure Thing,” *FiveThirtyEight*, <http://fivethirtyeight.com/features/an-80-percent-shot-doesnt-mean-clinton-is-a-sure-thing/>, HWilson)

David: And that in-between number gives Hillary Clinton about an 80 percent chance of winning, which obviously doesn’t mean it’s over.

Clare: Did Cookie vote Trump? Or is he a Bernie Bro?

Nate: I’m sort of annoyed by it being 80 percent, because I feel like that’s the number people most misinterpret. When you say 80 percent, people take that to mean “really, really certain.” It’s not, particularly.

David: I liked your ballgame analogy, Nate, in the article you wrote to accompany the forecast. Teams come back from 20-percent-win situations frequently. In fact, about 20 percent of the time!

Nate: Absolutely amazing how that works!

Clare: You’re annoyed that it’s a high number because people are going to glom onto that and think it holds for the whole election? Not realizing that this is where things stand as of June 29 and that it’ll change as things go on and polls come in?

Nate: It can change, sure. But let’s be clear — 80 percent is the forecast Clinton has to win on Nov. 8. That’s our best estimate of her chances, accounting for the uncertainty between now and then, based on the historical accuracy of presidential polling. If the election were held today instead, she’d be a safer bet still.

The polls can change a lot between now and Nov. 8. And they probably will. But there’s a chance those changes benefit Clinton, and not Donald Trump. And since she’s up by about 7 points now, there’s the chance they help Trump … but not enough to allow him to win.

And that’s the thing. Of the 80 percent of the time Clinton wins — PLENTY of those times are going to involve her sweating. Either because Trump makes it very close at the end or because there are some periods in which things look very tight along the way, as they did for Obama against McCain and against Romney.

But Clinton will win a lot of those close calls, along with her share of landslides.

Clare: So the Clinton campaign should not change its warm-up song to “Landslide” just yet? (The Fleetwood Mac version, obvs, not the Dixie Chicks cover.)

David: Because it’s a model, we’ll be feeding new polls into it as they come out every day, or whenever we have them. And the polls-plus version also changes with economic performance. So we can expect to see fluctuations in the numbers regularly, and sometimes those can be serious changes.

### 2NC – AT: Orlando Thumper

#### Clinton wins despite Orlando, but it does make it closer for Trump

Enten 6/13 – (Harry Enten is a senior political writer and analyst for FiveThirtyEight; 6/13/16, “Be Wary Of Claims About How The Orlando Attack Will Affect The Election,” *FiveThirtyEight*, <http://fivethirtyeight.com/features/be-wary-of-claims-about-how-the-orlando-attack-will-affect-the-election/>, Accessed 7/7/16, HWilson)\*\*\*note – graphs omitted

Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump have already responded to the deadliest mass shooting in U.S. history, which occurred Sunday morning at a gay nightclub in Orlando. Indeed, the massacre, carried out by a man who swore allegiance to the Islamic State, will reshape the dialog around the presidential election, in the short term at least. But the truth is that we don’t know how the tragedy will affect the race, and we should be careful about making too many conclusions based on the polls too soon.

Trump’s support rose in Republican primary polls in the wake of the terrorist attacks in Paris and San Bernardino in late 2015.

As my colleague Nate Silver wrote, Trump voters reacted positively to his calls for a temporary ban on any Muslims’ entering the U.S. and tougher restrictions on immigration more generally. Trump won a far higher percentage of the vote during the primaries among people who listed immigration as the issue most important to them and among those who favored a temporary ban on Muslim immigrants.

But, as Nate pointed out at the time, it’s difficult to tease out exactly how much of a bounce Trump really got. Moreover, Trump’s support didn’t move much after the bombings in Brussels in March, which suggests the voters disposed to favor Trump due to the threat of terrorism may have already moved into his camp. That is, voters are now aware of Trump’s positions, and he may not have any more ground to gain.

This leads to a second point: The general election electorate is much different than a GOP primary electorate. Just because Trump gained support among Republicans after a terrorist attack doesn’t necessarily mean he’ll gain among voters at large. Trump, for instance, saw his favorability ratings among Republicans go up during the primary, while at the same time they went down among both Democrats and independents. You can see this split between the Republican and general electorate on specific issues, too. In the most recent ABC News/Washington Post May poll — which found Trump leading Clinton in the horse race by 2 percentage points — just 43 percent of Americans favored a temporary ban on Muslim immigration,1 compared with 64 percent of Republicans. In the same poll, Clinton was more trusted than Trump on immigration, 51 percent to 42 percent, while Republicans favored Trump on the issue 83 percent to 11 percent.

That brings up point No. 3: There are a lot of directions in which this debate can go. Orlando involved a lone gunman, who swore allegiance to ISIS but didn’t have strong ties to it. The attacks involved a legally purchased gun and occurred at a gay nightclub. This was a mass shooting, a terrorist attack and a hate crime, making it hard to predict how the American public will react. Clinton, for her part, will likely try to make this debate about who is best prepared for a crisis. Polls show Americans view Clinton as better prepared than Trump is to deal with an international crisis. In the ABC News/Washington Post poll from May, she led Trump by 19 percentage points on this question. She also led Trump on who was more trusted on “social issues such as gay marriage and abortion” by 33 percentage points in a Gallup survey conducted in May.

Trump, meanwhile, repeated his call for a Muslim ban, on which the polling is more split. In comments on Monday, he repeatedly invoked the dangers of “radical Islam” and said “we have to control our borders,” essentially combining the two issues. Trump might also push the debate toward gun rights and the Second Amendment — an issue some of his supporters have already brought up and one on which he was slightly more trusted than Clinton in the May Gallup survey. On the broader issue of terrorism, Clinton holds a slight advantage in some surveys, while Trump does in others.

Because they have different strengths and weaknesses, Trump and Clinton are likely to try to frame the post-Orlando discussion much differently.

Finally, point No. 4: We may never know how exactly the Orlando attacks affected the 2016 election. The polls right now aren’t steady. Trump seemed to gain ground after he vanquished Ted Cruz and John Kasich from the race in early May. But over the past three weeks, Clinton has regained some of the edge she had lost. Now that she has become the presumptive nominee and Democrats bigwigs are rallying behind her, Clinton should theoretically be able to widen her advantage over Trump as some — perhaps most — wayward Bernie Sanders supporters pile on the bandwagon. If the polls, in fact, don’t move over the next couple of weeks, it could be a sign that the post-Orlando political environment is helping Trump. Or, it could also be the case that the bulk of Sanders supporters were never going to back Clinton (or are waiting for him to formally endorsement her). If nothing else, the attack reshapes what was going to be a unity week for Democrats, with Clinton meeting with Sanders on Tuesday night and an already canceled Clinton/President Obama rally in Wisconsin on Wednesday. Of course, Clinton may still pick up ground. How much of that is a presumptive nominee bounce versus that Americans think she is a better leader in a time of crisis? That’s going to be a difficult puzzle to solve.

### 2NC – AT: Trade Not Key / Clinton Distances

#### Trade’s a huge election issue – specifically with China – Clinton can’t distance herself despite her response to the TPP

Casselman et al., 6/13 – (Ben Casselman is FiveThirtyEight’s chief economics writer; Andrew Flowers is FiveThirtyEight’s quantitative editor; David Firestone, formerly a reporter and editor at The New York Times, is FiveThirtyEight’s managing editor; 6/13/16, “The Consequences: How Trade Became A Major Issue In 2016,” *FiveThirtyEight*, <http://fivethirtyeight.com/features/the-consequences-how-trade-became-a-major-issue-in-2016/>, Accessed 7/7/16, HWilson)

Welcome to the first installment of “The Consequences,” a series of chats about the issues being debated in this year’s political campaign. A couple of times every month, we’ll gather a group of FiveThirtyEight staffers and invited guests for a conversation on subjects in the news, particularly when the subjects are complex and could use a little illumination.

That’s an apt description of our first subject, international trade, which has become a central theme in this year’s presidential race. Our participants this week are two members of FiveThirtyEight’s economics staff, Ben Casselman, chief economics writer, and Andrew Flowers, quantitative editor. Also joining us is Dr. Shushanik Hakobyan, assistant professor of economics at Fordham University and a scholar of U.S. trade policy who has extensively analyzed the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and other international pacts. The moderator is David Firestone, FiveThirtyEight’s managing editor.

David: International trade has emerged from wonky obscurity to become one of the most heated issues in this year’s presidential campaign. Given its complexity, were you surprised to see trade blamed for so many of the country’s economic woes, attacked from both right and left as the reason for slow job growth and stagnant wages?

Shushanik: I was not at all surprised. Trade issues become hotly debated in every election season. The campaign rhetoric eventually gives way to a much calmer tone after the elections. Just recall the 2008 election season when Obama was campaigning against NAFTA. It was very similar in spirit to what we’ve seen this year, now with an added incentive to bash trade in the run up to the vote for the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP).

Ben: I agree, Shushanik, but I do think there’s something a bit different this time. For one thing, you have both major-party nominees coming out against the TPP, and Donald Trump has built his whole campaign around protectionism, which is unusual for a GOP nominee.

Andrew: It’s revealing the degree to which resentment about trade has been one of the driving issues in this election, at least in explaining Trump’s appeal. It’s an indication that the costs from trade have been very concentrated — more so than we thought. It’s hit a certain segment of American workers very hard. They’re angry and disaffected. For many of them, trade is to blame.

Shushanik: I agree, Andrew, but much of the research, including mine on NAFTA, suggests that a very small share of the labor force is affected by trade. Yes, it is true the impact is very concentrated not only by sector, but also by location.

Trade is an easy scapegoat for the economic situation and it is much more easily understandable by an average person.

David: What do each of you think of the quality of the debate we’re seeing? If you had a personal truth-o-meter, how would you rate the assertions that Trump and Sanders are making on trade in general, and the TPP and NAFTA in particular?

Ben: It’s interesting you highlight those two, David, because I think a lot of the evidence suggests the impact of both those agreements probably pales (or will pale, in the case of TPP) to the impact of trade with China. Research from MIT economist David Autor and various colleagues has pointed to pretty substantial impacts from liberalized trade with China, on the order of 2 to 2.4 million lost jobs.

Andrew: I don’t think Trump has elevated the debate on trade. His approach is populist and mercantilist — in the sense that “winning” at trade means exporting more to other countries than we import from them. He is furiously promising to renegotiate trade agreements and win a better “deal,” even if that means slapping a tariff on Chinese goods, which could potentially bring disastrous consequences via an escalating trade war.

Sanders, on the other hand, has just flatly opposed trade deals — both old and new. But Ben is right: Far more important than NAFTA or the TPP is China. That research by Autor et al. is stunning: they estimate at least 1 million U.S. manufacturing jobs were lost due to the rise of Chinese imports.

David: OK, let’s talk about China for a minute, and then get back to NAFTA and Shushanik’s research on it. Trump seems perfectly willing to start a trade war with China and has actually said it would have little harmful impact. Is there any economist out there who believes that?

Ben: There are some mainstream economists who have argued for at least a pause in new agreements. But I don’t know of any who think a trade war with China is a good idea.

Andrew: There are several reputable economists arguing for a more confrontational stance with China on specific trade issues like manipulation of their currency. But no serious economist would recommend what Trump’s saying he’ll do: tax Chinese imports until they give in to our demands.

Ben: Right. There are legitimate questions about whether China is playing by the rules in terms of opening up its markets.

Shushanik: I have yet to see any analysis confirming Trump’s claims on the impact of a trade war. The truth is that an average consumer benefits greatly from Chinese imports via lower prices and increased variety. Plus businesses are able to obtain intermediate goods [such as raw materials and parts used in manufacturing] at lower prices. Let’s not forget that about two-thirds of our imports are actually not final goods.

Andrew: Yes, the gains from trade with China are real — in the form of lower prices on goods — and these benefits disproportionately help poor Americans. But the costs from this trade with China are not diffuse but concentrated.

Ben: MIT Technology Review had a fun piece the other day looking at what the iPhone would look like if it were made entirely in America.

Shushanik: A few years back there was also a study showing that much of the value of an iPad is American, and only a small share is Chinese value added.

David: But why is it so hard for many Americans to see those benefits? Lower prices and variety always seem to be pushed to the side when trade is blamed for jobs.

Ben: Those benefits are individually small, even if they’re large in the aggregate. But a lost job is very big and easy to see. As Andrew said, the benefits are diffuse and the costs are concentrated.

Shushanik: Andrew is right. And this is true of any trade policy.

Ben: Of course, many would argue that we can help offset those costs — job retraining, direct benefits, or other programs to help people who lose jobs adjust. That’s the idea behind the “Trade Adjustment Assistance” program. But we haven’t expanded those efforts, and it doesn’t look like we will anytime soon.

Andrew: When people blame trade they often don’t just mean being out-competed by cheaper Chinese imports. They’re using trade as a stand-in for offshoring and outsourcing, too.

Shushanik: Here’s another example: Sugar costs twice as much in the U.S. than abroad due to quotas. As consumers we pay a few cents more per year, but the profits reaped by sugarcane farmers are huge.

Andrew: The real failure in American trade policy hasn’t so much been in specific deals or in the push for globalization more generally. The failure, as Ben noted, is that our safety net never modernized as trade expanded.

Ben: Not to mention automation. Remember: U.S. manufacturing employment is down, but output is way up.
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Andrew: Yes, but these trends predate the expansion in trade. They’re due to technology. To me, the real inflection point in how economists viewed trade happened in the 1990s, when trade joined technology in being a powerful driver behind the decline in manufacturing jobs.

Shushanik: Offshoring is also part of the story and cannot be ignored. Just recall the Carrier case recently.

Ben: Trump certainly recalls!

Andrew: It’s China joining the World Trade Organization (WTO) in 2001 that was the real game changer.

David: As you mentioned, Shushanik, the debate is similar around any trade pact. NAFTA is widely reviled by unions, for example, but your research has shown that much of that derision is undeserved.

Shushanik: NAFTA had an overall positive impact on real income in the U.S. There’s no indication that it had any impact on long-term employment. True, some jobs were lost in the short run, but job creation over the medium and long run outweighed jobs those lost due to NAFTA.

For most U.S. workers, any change in income due to NAFTA was insignificant. But for workers who were in the industries most vulnerable to imports from Mexico, blue-collar wage growth was significantly slower than for other workers while NAFTA was being implemented. That was also true for workers in locations where such vulnerable industries were concentrated.

Ben: I think it’s important to keep all of this in the broader context of the stagnation, or at least the anemic growth, of wages, particularly for those without a college degree. Some of that is trade. Some of that is globalization in other forms (outsourcing, etc.). Some of that is technology. Some of that is fiscal policy. And we can argue about how to allocate the blame. But the problem is real.

I think what has shifted somewhat is our understanding of how durable the negative impacts are for people who do lose jobs. The places that are hit hardest don’t seem to rebound as quickly as we once thought, as Autor and his colleagues recently noted. That doesn’t change the fact that liberalized trade is a net positive for the economy. But distribution matters too.

Shushanik: There were many structural changes in the U.S. economy, along with external factors (China’s W.T.O. accession, other low-income countries opening up to trade, etc.), that could be responsible for the decline in manufacturing jobs.

Ben: Right, part of the challenge here is there were a lot of changes hitting at once. It’s hard to tease out the specific factors that drove these trends.

Andrew: Good point.

Shushanik: Past experience with trade agreements suggests that although most workers will neither gain nor lose much, U.S. blue-collar workers in unskilled labor-intensive manufacturing industries are likely to suffer income losses. And if there are locations in the country where such jobs are concentrated, blue-collar workers in those locations (whether they are in the service sector or the manufacturing sector) are likely to suffer losses. However, such workers are much less numerous than they were at the time of NAFTA, since the manufacturing sector employs so many fewer Americans than it once did.

David: And yet it’s always a trade pact that gets the blame — the fallacy of the easy target. The consensus by the disaffected candidates on the right and left will put a lot of pressure on the center, though — specifically, Hillary Clinton, who has turned critical of the TPP. Do you see a long-term shift coming in how mainstream Washington thinks of trade and globalization, moving away from an earlier free-trade consensus?

Andrew: Economists’ consensus on trade circa 2000 was that it was good for the economy as a whole; and while there would be some “losers,” they would eventually find jobs in other industries or move to more prosperous towns. That hand-waving confidence in the benefits of trade now looks misguided.

Ben: One other trend that I think is important here is the decline in labor market mobility. People are changing jobs less often, they’re moving (physically) less often, companies are creating and destroying fewer jobs. And that makes it harder for workers and regions to adjust to shocks, including those caused by trade.

And unfortunately, we don’t really understand what’s behind that decline in dynamism, or how to reverse it.

Andrew: Clinton is in a bind, though: her husband supported and signed NAFTA, against the wishes of most Democrats. And while she is now against the TPP, she is still associated with President Obama, who supports it.

Ben: I strongly doubt that Clinton has suddenly turned into a huge trade skeptic. She turned against TPP — I won’t try to guess whether that was purely political, but politics clearly played a role — but she isn’t railing against trade the way Trump is. So if she wins, I suspect we’ll retain the basic trade policy we’ve had since NAFTA, with maybe just a bit more of a nudge to the left. If Trump wins… who knows? It’s notable that he doesn’t say he wants to end free trade, he just wants better agreements, whatever that means.

### 2NC – AT: Approval Rating Not Key

#### Approval ratings of incumbents do matter – perception and the importance of executive authority

Dickerson 7/5 – (John Dickerson is the anchor of CBS News' Face the Nation, the number one Sunday morning public affairs program. He also serves as Political Director for CBS News; 7/5/16, “The unusual chumminess of Clinton and Obama,” *Face the Nation*, <http://www.cbsnews.com/news/the-unusual-chumminess-of-clinton-and-obama/>, Accessed 7/7/16, HWilson)

In their first public campaign stop together, President Obama and Hillary Clinton visit the purple state of North Carolina Monday. Mr. Obama has a mixed record in North Carolina, which went for him the first time he ran in 2008 and then denied him a victory in 2012, when he lost to Mitt Romney by 90,000 votes. If Hillary Clinton is offering a third Obama term, 2016 will be the rubber match.

The last time the relationship between candidate and incumbent was this close was in 1988 when Ronald Reagan stumped for his vice president, George H.W. Bush. Given how tricky that association was, the Clinton-Obama tandem may be the least fraught alliance between incumbent and campaigner in presidential history.

Usually, presidential candidates are not this chummy with the incumbent president of the same party. It's a little like the relationship between a teenager and a parent. The child must rely on the parent for certain things only a parent can provide, but the teen resents the dependency. (Get Out of My Life, but First Could You Drive Me & Cheryl to the Mall is the title of a great parenting book that captures this phenomenon.)

In 1960, President Eisenhower, known for his hidden-hand style of leadership inadvertently gave Nixon the Heisman when asked about his number two. He hadn't meant to. In fact, he'd been insisting to reporters at a news conference that Nixon had been involved in shaping policy. But then when he was asked to name an idea that had originated with Nixon, Eisenhower said "If you give me a week, I might think of one." Kennedy used the line in a campaign ad to undermine Nixon's repeated claim that he had more experience than Kennedy.

In 1968, Vice President Hubert Humphrey desperately tried to run out from under Lyndon Johnson and his unpopular Vietnam policies. Humphrey only saw his numbers really improve when he finally broke with the president on the war.

In 2000, Al Gore avoided Bill Clinton so much that according to Taylor Branch's book The Clinton Tapes Clinton complained to Gore after the race that he was disappointed that he wasn't used more. Gore was angry Clinton hadn't apologized to him about his affair with Monica Lewinsky, and he blamed Clinton for his loss to George Bush.

Candidates want to stand on their own two feet to give voters a unique figure to get excited about. Association with the old boss makes that harder because people think you're just a weak imitation of the guy they used to like. After seven years in Clinton's shadow, Gore famously fought to show that he was an Alpha Dog, paying feminist Naomi Wolf $15,000 a month to give him advice on how he could appear more assertive (she reportedly told him, among other things, to wear more earth tones).

Vice President George H.W. Bush kept trying to convince Reagan's aides to put him at the center of administration events so that he could burnish his own public image but grew frustrated when they didn't. "It's almost as if I don't exist," Bush wrote in his diary, according to Jon Meacham's Destiny and Power.

Bush also had to navigate around the Iran-Contra Affair in which he was implicated. Still, Reagan's approval rating was near 60 percent at the end of his term and the duo was the only one since FDR to win three consecutive terms for the same party.

In 2008, John McCain didn't want to be near George W. Bush in his campaign. "I understood he had to establish his independence," Bush wrote. "I thought it looked defensive for John to distance himself from me. I was confident I could have helped him make his case. But the decision was his. I was disappointed I couldn't do more to help him."

Vice presidents or administration officials who try to distance themselves from the presidents they served are engaged in a totally bootless pursuit. (You can roll your eyes at your parents but you can't pretend you don't share the same genes.) Voters don't buy it, which makes efforts to wriggle out from the reality of things look disingenuous. It also creates an ongoing tension that can fill any news cycle as aides fight a shadow war in the press.

This connection between campaigns and incumbents is even stronger in the modern world of polarization, where little gets done through the legislature. Presidents rely on executive action more, which means the nominee of a party is ever more tied to the incumbent whose work they always promise not to undo. Their opponents, on the other hand, can make easy promises to shred all executive actions on the first day.

How helpful can Barack Obama be to Hillary Clinton? His approval rating is near 50 percent now, and it has been climbing to heights not seen since his re-election bid. Some political scientists argue that the approval rating of the incumbent is a possible predictor of electoral success.

The president will use his current experience in the Situation Room to attest to Clinton's readiness for the job. When Mr. Obama endorsed her several weeks ago, he put her at center stage in the bin Laden raid when citing her qualifications.

The president has particular strength in the African American community. In 2012, when appealing to black voters, he asked them to have his back. Now he'll ask them to do it against the man who led the effort to suggest he was not a legitimate president because of his Kenyan birth.

North Carolina has the largest African American population of any of the traditionally competitive states, at 22 percent, slightly higher than Virginia, which has a 20 percent black population and where we will also likely see President Obama campaign. North Carolina also has a large share of suburban female voters and college-educated voters, two groups the Clinton team hopes to target against Trump.

President Obama once said he understood that voters needed to have that "new car smell," which some took as a dig at Hillary Clinton. There's no more of that now. He's all in. It's the best way he can protect his legacy. Plus, he also really dislikes Donald Trump.

### 2NC – AT: Approval Rating Not Key
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North Carolina has the largest African American population of any of the traditionally competitive states, at 22 percent, slightly higher than Virginia, which has a 20 percent black population and where we will also likely see President Obama campaign. North Carolina also has a large share of suburban female voters and college-educated voters, two groups the Clinton team hopes to target against Trump.

President Obama once said he understood that voters needed to have that "new car smell," which some took as a dig at Hillary Clinton. There's no more of that now. He's all in. It's the best way he can protect his legacy. Plus, he also really dislikes Donald Trump.

## \*\*\*SPECIFIC STATES\*\*\*

## Florida

### 2NC – UQ – Florida – Obama Key

#### Florida has historically been vulnerable to swings, but Obama’s support gives Clinton an edge

Cahn 6/30 – (Emily Cahn is a senior writer for Mic covering politics, 6/30/16, “4 States Where Barack Obama Can Boost Hillary Clinton's Campaign,” *Policy Mic*, <https://mic.com/articles/147394/4-states-where-barack-obama-can-boost-hillary-clinton-s-campaign#.EL7qIPl9A>, Accessed 7/7/16, HWilson)

Democrats are fired up and ready to unleash President Barack Obama.

Obama will hit the campaign trail on Tuesday in Charlotte, North Carolina — his first joint-appearance with presumptive Democratic presidential nominee Hillary Clinton since he endorsed her earlier this month.

With his approval rating averaging more than 50% for the first time since early 2013, Democrats say Obama will be an asset to their party in the fall. And they are planning to lean on him to help Clinton win in November and cement his presidential legacy.

Yet while Democrats say Obama's popularity will be a boon in November, they add that there are certain places he's most likely to appear as Election Day draws near.

Look for Obama and Clinton to hit suburban areas in swing states. While places such as Arizona and Georgia — traditionally Red states where polls show Clinton within striking distance — might not benefit from a visit from Obama.

"I think that the president can and be an asset pretty much anywhere, but particularly with young people, particularly in swing states he's done well in, and particularly in some of the more suburban areas of these swing states," Shripal Shah, communications director for Senate Majority PAC, a super PAC working to flip the Senate back to Democratic control in November, said. "Those are the people that pretty much built his coalition in '08 and '12, and those are the people who are still persuadable. and he's the the best messenger to persuade them"

Here are the four places where Obama can help Clinton the most.

North Carolina

North Carolina is a firmly purple state, thanks to a growing number of northerners moving to the Tar Heel State due to its thriving economy.

Obama won here in 2008 by less than a one-point margin, and lost four years later by two points.

In 2016, polling in the state shows Clinton and Trump in a virtual tie, with Clinton leading in the New York Times polling average by a mere 0.4%.

Democrats say Obama will be an asset to Clinton in areas such as Charlotte, where he remains immensely popular with the sizable minority populations.

Moreover, Obama can help Clinton in the Raleigh-Durham area, which is filled with younger, educated white voters that might need prodding to back Clinton after a contentious primary with Sen. Bernie Sanders.

And winning North Carolina would be a good omen for Clinton in November. If she carries the state, there's almost no path for Trump to secure the 270 Electoral College votes necessary for victory.

Florida

The Sunshine State is perpetual swing territory.

Obama carried it twice — by a nearly three-point margin in 2008 and by a slim one-point margin in 2012.

Florida's growing Hispanic population makes the state fertile territory in Clinton's race against Trump, who has attacked Mexican immigrants and promised to build a wall across the U.S.-Mexico border.

Democrats say minority-heavy areas in south and central Florida are ripe for Obama to campaign in.

Populous cities such as Orlando, Miami and Tampa are where Democrats build their margins of victory in the state, and where Obama is most likely to campaign in with Clinton.

"I anticipate that he will be really helpful in central Florida, whether it's Tampa or Orlando," said Ana Cruz, former executive director of the Florida Democratic Party. "Remember, back in '08, shortly after Hillary conceded, [one of their first appearances] together was in Orlando, Florida, and it drew huge crowd because of the ... diverse demographics that central Florida has."

### 2NC – UQ – Florida

#### Clinton’s leading in Florida, but there’s only a risk voters switch to Trump because of Clinton distrust

Lightman 5/27 – (David Lightman, writer for McClatchy newspapers and the Miami Herald, 5/27/16, “How swing voters could swing – to Trump,” *Miami Herald*, <http://www.miamiherald.com/news/politics-government/article80183192.html>, Accessed 7/5/16, HWilson)

TAMPA, FLA.

They are the people who decide elections, shun partisan labels or loyalty, and swing back and forth between the major political parties from election to election. And they have a problem.

They can’t stand either Hillary Clinton or Donald Trump.

With Clinton, they really don’t like the way she used private email as secretary of state in defiance of the rules, reinforcing their view that the presumptive Democratic nominee is a smug, arrogant insider. With Trump, who clinched the Republican nomination this week, they see a self-absorbed loudmouth unfit to fill the world’s most powerful job.

Yet interviews with dozens of swing voters in the pivotal corridor between Tampa Bay and Orlando also revealed a potential clue to how they could go this fall in battleground Florida, if not everywhere. The key: It may end up being easier for a candidate to change behavior than résumé. And that’s why there is a potential for them to swing to Trump.

If swing voters are important anywhere, they’re particularly crucial in this central part of the Sunshine State. Florida has voted for the presidential winner in every election but one – 1992 – since 1964. So has Hillsborough County, which includes Tampa and its suburbs and was at the center of these interviews by McClatchy with The Bradenton Herald.

Katherine Reynolds, a dance teacher from Inverness, is among the undecided.

She saw President Barack Obama eight years ago as an important harbinger of change. “We needed new blood, and I thought perhaps as the first black president, we’d get a fair share in the economy for everybody,” she said. “We didn’t.”

She voted for Republican Mitt Romney in 2012. This time, no one moves her. “I won’t say Trump is my favorite person,” she said. But Clinton, she said, is “devious.”

Trump, at least, seems to connect comfortably with ordinary people, she said. “He has a good chance of helping the working class,” Reynolds figured. She’ll keep listening, keep watching.

Others throughout the region echoed her quandary.

“A lot comes down to character,” said Cassandra Holbrook, a Manatee Technical College student. At the moment she finds Trump “a little too self-important,” but she has serious questions about Clinton’s past.

“There’s a distrust factor with Clinton, but Trump’s rhetoric worries me,” said Henry Scarfo, a Lake Mary retiree who backed Obama in 2008 and then Romney.

One thing that could send him Trump’s way is a signal from Republican leaders, notably House Speaker Paul Ryan, that Trump is OK.

The swing voters are an unusually hard bloc to handicap, because the 2016 election is different from any other in recent times.

One survey in battlegrounds Colorado, Florida, Nevada and Ohio finds that swing voters are 21 percent of the electorate and voted for different parties in the last two elections, 2012 and 2014.

They largely call themselves independents (84 percent), have less college education than the broader electorate and include fewer African-Americans, the same percentage of Latinos and fewer liberals, according to the poll for the Progressive Policy Institute, a moderate Democratic-leaning research group. They are mostly concerned about the economy, and are more concerned with growth than fairness.

“Whether it comes down to policy or personality is yet to be determined,” said Stephen Hahn-Griffiths, vice president at the Reputation Institute, a research group that studies public images. This could be the rare election where personality will make the difference, and so far Trump has done well selling his brand.

Fifty-four percent of voters nationwide view Clinton negatively, according to last week’s NBC News/Wall Street Journal poll. Trump is seen that way by 58 percent, though that’s down from 65 percent in April, as he started trying to paint himself as a more sensible, committed Republican and less of an outspoken maverick. That 7-point improvement suggested Trump has the potential to improve his standing further.

Rich Moralis, a retiree from Dunedin, has voted for both Republicans and Democrats for president. He backed Obama in 2012, but Clinton annoys him. “She’s a liar,” he said.

Moralis is Hispanic, and is well aware that Trump insulted Mexicans last year by suggesting many immigrants were rapists. “Trump is kind of racial,” Moralis said, but that could be outweighed by his outsider status.

Duane Pike, a retiree from Land O’ Lakes, saw good and bad in Trump. “Do I like the guy personally? No,” he said. “But I like his candor, and he’s gotten the average American to come out and vote.”

A big barrier to potential Clinton support, and perhaps one that limits her upside, is her email turmoil.

The FBI is looking into whether the former secretary of state’s use of a private server put government secrets at risk. On Wednesday, the State Department inspector general found that she had not sought permission to use the private service. Clinton spokesman Brian Fallon noted there has been “no evidence of any successful breach of the secretary’s server.”

To Matthew Durshimer, a civil engineer from Tampa, there seems to be a double standard at work for Clinton. He noted one email chain where Clinton had requested a secure fax to be sent on a non-secure line.

“If my fiancée did something like that she’d be fired,” Durshimer said.

Something else in the Clinton character troubles these voters.

She seems cold, even ruthlessly ambitious, willing to do anything to get elected, they say. They’ve watched her bend this year on the Trans-Pacific Partnership, the trade pact she once supported but now opposes, and on the minimum wage. Clinton had said it was a matter for states, but now she backs a higher national minimum.

Adelmarie Bones, an environmental scientist from Tampa, wants to see more genuine feeling for others in Clinton. “I see a passion to become president,” she said, but little else.

Bones wants Clinton to emulate her friends and her. “My dream is to be a partner in my firm, and be able to help others,” she said. Her vote this fall? “I’m very conflicted. I’m very disappointed in both candidates.” She’ll decide after “reading a lot.”

Trump’s challenge is different from Clinton’s.

She can’t erase the email controversy or her past record. But he can change his behavior and appear more statesmanlike, less bombastic. The same candor that made him a popular outlier is a risk with swing voters, who tend to study candidates carefully. Clearly, his mouth and the perception that he lacks gravitas and commitment hold him back with the general election holdouts.

#### Clinton has a slight lead, but it’s close – Trump does have a path to victory

Silver et al, 6/14 – (Nate Silver is the founder and editor in chief of FiveThirtyEight; Harry Enten is a senior political writer and analyst for FiveThirtyEight; Julia Azari is an associate professor of political science at Marquette University. Her research interests include the American presidency, political parties, and political rhetoric; 6/14/16, “Can Trump And Clinton Transform The Electoral Map?,” *FiveThirtyEight*, <http://fivethirtyeight.com/features/can-trump-and-clinton-transform-the-electoral-map/>, Accessed 7/5/16, HWilson)

micah: All right! To wrap things up: Florida. Could Trump’s horrible numbers among Hispanic voters basically take Florida off the board?

julia: Sometimes when I close my eyes I still see the 2000 map flipping back and forth.

micah: That may be a sign you need to step away from politics for a couple days, Julia.

julia: It was my first presidential election and very formative.

harry: Trump, though, has also done well among nonreligious Republicans, and there are a ton of those in Florida. He absolutely wiped the floor with Marco Rubio in the Florida primary for a reason.

micah: Lots of Northeastern transplants too.

natesilver: The Hispanic population in Florida has gradually become more like the Hispanic population elsewhere in the country, which is bad news for Republicans, because some of those older Cubans were pretty GOP-leaning.

Harry’s right, though, that some of the other demographics in Florida seem decent for Trump. They’re decent for Clinton too, though, who also does relatively well with older voters. Florida might be the anti-Colorado in some ways, a comparatively good fit for both candidates.

If you look at the polls in Florida, though — rather than try to extrapolate from the demographics — they suggest that it’s polling right in line with the national average, instead of being a pinch Republican-leaning. In other words, it might be a true tipping-point state this year.

#### Orlando changes the game – Trump’s now tied with Clinton in Florida

Catanese 6/15 – (David Catanese is senior politics writer for U.S. News & World Report and founder of the blog The Run 2016; 6/15/16, “Florida Republicans Think the Orlando Attack Will Help Trump,” *U.S. News*, <http://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2016-06-15/florida-republicans-think-the-orlando-attack-will-help-trump>, Accessed 7/6/16, HWilson)

Florida Republicans believe the massacre inside an Orlando nightclub will lift Donald Trump's presidential candidacy in their state, driving voters to embrace more aggressive tactics to thwart future domestic terror attacks.

"The more that issue comes to the fore, the more that strengthens Trump over [Hillary] Clinton," says Peter Feaman, a Republican National Committeeman from Florida. "It's because the threat of Islamic terrorism has now come home. It's no longer Ft. Hood, it's no longer San Bernardino . . . it's now Orlando."

The Obama-Clinton Tag Team

The shooting spree that claimed the lives of 49 people Sunday has once again thrust national security to the center of the White House race. Trump responded by expanding on his call for a temporary ban on Muslims entering the U.S. with a more sweeping restriction: a halt on immigrants from any country with a history of terrorism.

His Democratic opponent, Hillary Clinton, has called Trump's proposals "un-American" and "dangerous," and instead favors building bonds within Muslim communities to counter radicalization at home while taking on those who embrace a "perverted version of Islam" abroad.

But even Republicans who have issues with Trump's radical policy prescriptions and overheated oratory think the mass carnage inflicted in the Sunshine State on Sunday may alter people's mindsets about safeguarding the country from threats.

"I think people are getting scared and getting a little paranoid, and I think that lends itself to some of Trump's arguments," says Brett Doster, a veteran Tallahassee-based GOP operative who worked for Jeb Bush's presidential campaign. "People want strength and I think he owns that argument right now. In times of duress, people tend to be attracted to a stronger leader with a bigger personality. I'm kind of appalled our party is nominating him. I won't work for him, can't bring myself to. But I think the guy is going to end up being president. I think he's on track to probably win this thing."

In a national poll of likely voters commissioned by Bloomberg Politics and taken the Friday before the Orlando attack through Monday's aftermath, Clinton carved out one of her largest leads against Trump this year: 12 percentage points. But on the question of who would better combat terrorist threats at home and abroad, Trump topped Clinton 50 percent to 45 percent.

On Monday, as details of the slaughter by the 29-year-old Muslim man with an apparent affinity for the Islamic State group emerged, the pollsters added a question to the survey and posed it to 408 likely voters: "A year from now, if a situation similar to the Orlando shootings were to happen, there will be a different president in the White House. Would you have more confidence in Hillary Clinton or Donald Trump to deal with it as president?"

The answer was closely contested, with Trump nabbing a slim advantage over Clinton inside the margin of error, 45 percent to 41 percent. Fifteen percent weren't sure. Meanwhile, the latest polling out of Florida, the closest battleground state in the 2012 presidential race, shows a dead heat between the two presumptive nominees.

Taken together, the numbers demonstrate how pervasive fears about Islamic extremism could bolster Trump's case for a more rash set of actions to curb the global threat. Even if voters disagree with Trump's specific prescriptions, they may be more inclined to support a steely, muscular counterterrorism approach once such a horrific event transpires so close to home.

#### Clinton and Trump are functionally tied – any slip-ups mean a Florida loss

Catanese 6/10 – (David Catanese is senior politics writer for U.S. News & World Report and founder of the blog The Run 2016, 6/10/16, “As General Election Begins, Clinton Holds a Narrow Edge Over Trump,” *U.S. News*, <http://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2016-06-10/clinton-begins-general-election-with-narrow-edge-over-unpredictable-trump>, Accessed 7/6/16, HWilson)

With just under five months until Americans pick a new president, Hillary Clinton begins the 2016 general election campaign holding a slim advantage over Donald Trump, who has surprisingly kept pace with the presumptive Democratic nominee while weathering a cyclone of strife within the Republican Party.

The New York City billionaire essentially wrapped up the GOP nomination five weeks ago, but failed to reap the benefit of a monthlong head start against Clinton, who became the first woman to clinch a major party's presidential bid earlier this week.

Clinton Captures Big Endorsements

While Clinton's attention was divided by having to fend off Sen. Bernie Sanders of Vermont, Trump could've used the time to build out his team, broaden his organizational presence in swing states, cultivate relationships with reluctant donors and sharpen his case against the former secretary of state.

Instead, he ensnared himself in a racially charged controversy in defending the now-defunct Trump University while his campaign leadership experienced a turbulent stint of skirmishes that prompted the firing of its political director. On top of that, many of his former Republican rivals remain uncommitted to his candidacy and other prominent conservatives are running away from it. The Grand Old Party has not yet fully come to terms with its standard-bearer.

Even so, Trump remarkably remains in the game – a byproduct of a highly polarized country forced to choose between two widely known but highly disliked candidates who are shouldering considerable baggage.

"Given all the trouble Trump has caused, and a lot of it for himself . . . he is still pretty close in the polls," Bill Bennett, a former secretary of education under President Ronald Reagan, said Wednesday evening on Fox News.

A pair of surveys taken last weekend in the battleground states of Florida and Pennsylvania prove the case. In Pennsylvania – a state Republicans haven't carried in a presidential election since 1988 – Clinton is ahead of Trump by only a single point, according to the Democratic-leaning Public Policy Polling.

In Florida, the third-most populous state with 29 electoral votes, Public Policy Polling tracked Trump edging Clinton by just 1 point.

### 2NC – Florida – AT: Demographics

#### Increased Hispanic population doesn’t matter – low turnout and right-wing retirees outweigh

Klas 7/2 – (MARY ELLEN KLAS, writer for the Miami Herald/Times Tallahassee Bureau, 7/2/16, “Hispanic growth in Florida: Will it determine the election?,” *Miami Herald*, <http://www.miamiherald.com/news/politics-government/state-politics/article87250257.html>, Accessed 7/5/16, HWilson)

What difference does four years make? For Florida, in a presidential election year, the difference means surging population growth that could influence the outcome of the national contest.

The state remains a crucial swing state in the presidential sweepstakes but, since 2012, Florida’s electorate has changed in important ways — exacerbating the role of its growing Hispanic and elderly populations and potentially sowing seeds of a more disruptive revolution to come.

The generational and ideological tensions that could emerge between the aging baby boomers, who data shows have become more conservative and less trusting of government, and Florida’s increasingly diverse younger generations have the potential to make Florida a bellwether for the nation — again.

New population data released by the U.S. Census bureau June 23 shows that the state grew by 1.46 million people from 2010 to 2015. Looking at ethnicity, Hispanics represent 51 percent of the growth. Looking at age groups, people 65 and older represent 46 percent of the growth. In five years, Florida’s Hispanic population grew 18 percent overall — six times more than non-Hispanic whites, and more than twice as fast as blacks.

More than a third of the growth — 269,911 people — occurred in Miami-Dade and Broward counties, the epicenter of the state’s Hispanic population. But the fastest growth occurred in the counties along the I-4 corridor from Orange, Osceola and Seminole counties to Polk and Hillsborough, which saw its Hispanic population rise by a combined total of 219,229.

The Hispanic population also grew in counties with previously less dense populations. St. John’s County, the bedroom community south of Jacksonville where the $65,575 median income is the highest in the state, saw a 42 percent increase in its Hispanic population. Nearly 4,400 more Hispanics are now living there. Nearby Clay County had a 32 percent increase in Hispanic residents, with 4,876 more newcomers.

And in Florida’s Panhandle, home to three military bases, Santa Rosa, Okaloosa and Bay counties saw increases in their Hispanic residents of between 39 percent to 34 percent between 2010 and 2015.

But to pollsters and political observers, the focus is on the potential impact of these demographic shifts in the November election.

“Florida is the biggest swing state in the country, therefore it is the biggest swing state with a Hispanic population,” said Peter A. Brown, assistant director of the Quinnipiac University Poll. “It is no surprise there has been a substantial increase in the Hispanic population in the state. The question is, how many people are registered to vote and how many of them actually show up?”

The participation rate for Hispanics in elections has been historically low. Nationally, and in Florida, the population is young — nearly half are under age 29 and millennials tend to vote infrequently — and many are immigrants who have not established citizenship yet.

Miami-Dade County, which has the highest percentage of Hispanics in the state with 66.7 percent of its population Latino, also saw the lowest voter turnout rate in the state in the 2014 midterm elections with only 41 percent of its registered voters casting a ballot.

“There is an exceptionally large delta between the percent of population who is Hispanic and percent of the electorate that is Hispanic,’’ said Steve Schale, a Democratic political consultant. He believes the real number of Hispanic voters is actually higher than it appears on paper, since many of those who registered to vote before 2006 did not have the option to self-identify as Hispanic.

But the surge in Hispanic voters in Florida could also be offset by the increase in the group that is among the most reliable voters — those who are white and over age 65. Among this group, Florida is the stronghold of the nation.

According to the latest census numbers, Florida had the highest percentage of its population age 65 and over — 19.5 percent — among states in 2015.

Sumter County is home to one of the fastest-growing metro areas, The Villages, and is the only county in the nation where the majority reached retirement age in 2015. The median age: 67. The median household income: $49,874. The region votes Republican and is conservative but in the last five years Sumter also saw an increase in its Hispanic population: 20 percent.

### 2NC – Florida Not Key

#### \*\*\*note when prepping file --- this evidence can be used to answer some of the aff arguments that it’s impossible for Trump to win in Florida

#### Even if Trump loses Florida, he can still win by capturing the rust belt

Geier 16 – (Ben Geier is a writer at Fortune.com; 5/6/16, “Here's How Donald Trump Can Win in November,” *Fortune*, <http://fortune.com/2016/05/06/heres-how-donald-trump-can-win-in-november/>, HWilson)

It will likely come down to the Rust Belt and the Midwest.

Donald Trump is up against what seems like tremendous odds to capture the presidency this fall. After romping through the primaries and discarding his rivals one by one, he is now poised to go mano a mano with Hillary Clinton, and most polls point towards a Clinton rout.

But Democrats shouldn’t be too confident, and Donald Trump fans should not feel like there’s no hope. By tweaking the electoral strategy used by Republican candidates for the past four election cycles, Trump has a legitimate chance at transforming the electoral map and catapulting himself into the White House. Put simply, Trump will need to zero in on the Rust Belt and parts of the Midwest. To pull that off, he’ll need to turn several historically blue presidential election states red.

Since 2000, five states have been critical to Republican presidential strategy: Florida, Ohio, Nevada, Colorado, and New Mexico. The first four have voted twice for Republicans and twice for Democrats. New Mexico went for the Democratic candidate in every presidential election since 2000 except 2004.

But when the GOP did well in those five states, they won the presidential race. It put George W. Bush in the White House for two terms. Those states are important to Democratic candidates, too. President Obama won all five of those states, twice. And if Mitt Romney had won those five states, he would have unseated Obama.

To win these crucial states, Republicans have historically tried to appeal to the Hispanic community and young voters. It’s been an uphill battle for most Republicans, and it certainly wouldn’t be an easy feat for Trump. He is mostly loathed by Hispanic voters, and he will face a challenge getting through to young voters outside of his key demographic of lower-income, less educated white people.

To win, Trump will need to put the previous GOP strategy aside. Instead, he may look to keep Ohio in the mix and then set his gaze on the remainder of the Rust Belt and the Midwest: Michigan, Pennsylvania, Iowa, Missouri, and Wisconsin.

In the Midwest, “you have this grouping of blue collar, middle income households,” says John Brabender, a Republican strategist who has been viewed as the architect of Pennsylvanian Republican Rick Santorum’s career. Brabender notes that in Ohio specifically, a large number of conservative voters didn’t show up to the polls for Mitt Romney in 2012.

## Michigan

### 2NC – UQ – Michigan

#### The election’s a dead heat and Trump’s ramping up focus on Michigan – predictions that Hillary’s winning underestimate Trump’s ability to rally

Gibbons 5/25 – (Lauren Gibbons is a political reporter on MLive's Impact team; 5/25/16, “Can Donald Trump win Michigan in the November election?,” *MLive*, <http://www.mlive.com/news/index.ssf/2016/05/can_trump_win_in_michigan.html>, Accessed 7/7/16, HWilson)

LANSING, MI — A growing number of Michigan Republicans are bullish on New York businessman Donald Trump's chances at turning a consistently blue state red come the November presidential election.

Although the latest poll data still shows likely Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton with a double-digit lead against Trump in the state, many are acknowledging that Michigan shouldn't necessarily be treated as a given as the general election approaches.

Political news website Real Clear Politics shows Clinton averaging a lead of 10.5 percentage points in polls pitting her against Trump conducted between Feb. 22 and March 24.

But Trump's campaign recently listed Michigan as one of its targets for the general election, and new national polling shows Trump and Clinton in a statistical dead heat.

In a recent interview with CNN's Jake Tapper, Trump national convention manager Paul Manafort included Michigan on a list of Democratic-leaning states that could give Trump the possibility to expand the electoral map in his favor, listing independents, crossover Democrats and supporters of Vermont Sen. Bernie Sanders as potential Trump voters.

"We think the Democrats are the ones who are going to have a very narrow way to victory, and we think we're going to be successful," he told Tapper.

Bernie Porn, partner and president of polling firm EPIC-MRA, said based on the numbers so far, Michigan — a state that hasn't carried a Republican presidential candidate since 1988, when George H.W. Bush defeated Michael Dukakis — continues to lean Democratic. But he warned against taking that trend for granted, considering the unpredictability of the 2016 election so far.

"If I were the Democrats, I would not make any assumptions at this juncture," he said. "People have underestimated Donald Trump throughout the primary — Democrats should not make that mistake.

"Assume it's going to be purple" — at least until consistent polling data says otherwise, Porn continued.

Falling in line

Several prominent Republicans in Michigan have already jumped aboard the Trump train.“ Lt. Gov. Brian Calley endorsed the candidate this week, and U.S. Rep. Candice Miller told Politico earlier this month that she looks forward to a "President Trump" come next year.

Although the Republican Party is in a "healing process" following the primary, Michigan Republican Party Chair Ronna Romney McDaniel said the party is already making moves to coalesce behind the presumptive nominee.

Couple that with Michigan Republicans' energy, appetite to take back the White House and distrust of Clinton, McDaniel said, and the Republican presidential nominee could "absolutely" win in a state that currently boasts a Republican governor, attorney general and secretary of state.

The 2016 election also gives the Michigan Republican Party a chance to tap into new potential Republican voters — independents, disgruntled Democrats, young people and others, McDaniel said.

"There's a recognition that the same old, same old seen from Washington over and over again is not changing things in our lives," McDaniel said.

### 2NC – L – Michigan – Trade

#### Increased bashing of Dems on trade gives Trump the state

Spangler 7/5 – (Todd Spangler, writer for the Tennessean, 7/5/16, “Experts: Trump's trade plans bad news for car companies,” *The Tennessean*, <http://www.tennessean.com/story/money/2016/07/05/experts-trumps-trade-plans-bad-news-car-companies/86706120/>, Accessed 7/7/16, HWilson)

WASHINGTON — In no area has Donald Trump challenged Republican orthodoxy more than on international trade, where he has promised to force better deals for U.S. manufacturers or otherwise impose debilitating tariffs on imports, or unilaterally rip up long-standing trade agreements.

But far from guaranteeing a stronger American economy, many experts — including some Trump regularly cites when making his case for a more protectionist trade policy — say they believe such actions could result in higher consumer prices, unemployment and trade wars.

And that may be especially true for the American auto industry.

Trump last week threatened to tear up the 1994 North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) with Canada and Mexico or impose a crippling 35% tariff on Mexican imports if he can’t force concessions, but such a move could hurt automakers and their suppliers — which rely on materials and plants inside and outside the U.S. — resulting in higher prices and a less competitive product worldwide.

“Today, there is no such thing as an American car, there’s no such thing as a Canadian car, and there’s no such thing as a Mexican car. There are only North American cars,” said Chris Wilson, deputy director of the Mexico Institute at the Wilson Center, a research organization in Washington, D.C. “What would the auto industry look like if we didn’t have things like NAFTA? It would not be as strong.”

But in choosing to go after foreign trading partners and accusing U.S. manufacturers, including Ford, of turning their backs on American workers by opening plants in other countries, Trump, the presumptive Republican presidential nominee, has adopted a long-standing Democratic line of attack — one that some fear could rouse Rust Belt voters in Ohio, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin and Michigan who believe that trade deals are to blame for the loss of manufacturing jobs.

The United Auto Workers — which endorsed Democrat Hillary Clinton — has joined Trump in denouncing Ford's plans to open a new plant in Mexico, despite the company's contention that it won't result in a loss of U.S. jobs.

## North Carolina

### 2NC – UQ – North Carolina – Obama Key

#### Clinton and Trump are neck and neck in North Carolina, but Obama’s support and approval helps her win now

Cahn 6/30 – (Emily Cahn is a senior writer for Mic covering politics, 6/30/16, “4 States Where Barack Obama Can Boost Hillary Clinton's Campaign,” *Policy Mic*, <https://mic.com/articles/147394/4-states-where-barack-obama-can-boost-hillary-clinton-s-campaign#.EL7qIPl9A>, Accessed 7/7/16, HWilson)

Democrats are fired up and ready to unleash President Barack Obama.

Obama will hit the campaign trail on Tuesday in Charlotte, North Carolina — his first joint-appearance with presumptive Democratic presidential nominee Hillary Clinton since he endorsed her earlier this month.

With his approval rating averaging more than 50% for the first time since early 2013, Democrats say Obama will be an asset to their party in the fall. And they are planning to lean on him to help Clinton win in November and cement his presidential legacy.

Yet while Democrats say Obama's popularity will be a boon in November, they add that there are certain places he's most likely to appear as Election Day draws near.

Look for Obama and Clinton to hit suburban areas in swing states. While places such as Arizona and Georgia — traditionally Red states where polls show Clinton within striking distance — might not benefit from a visit from Obama.

"I think that the president can and be an asset pretty much anywhere, but particularly with young people, particularly in swing states he's done well in, and particularly in some of the more suburban areas of these swing states," Shripal Shah, communications director for Senate Majority PAC, a super PAC working to flip the Senate back to Democratic control in November, said. "Those are the people that pretty much built his coalition in '08 and '12, and those are the people who are still persuadable. and he's the the best messenger to persuade them"

Here are the four places where Obama can help Clinton the most.

North Carolina

North Carolina is a firmly purple state, thanks to a growing number of northerners moving to the Tar Heel State due to its thriving economy.

Obama won here in 2008 by less than a one-point margin, and lost four years later by two points.

In 2016, polling in the state shows Clinton and Trump in a virtual tie, with Clinton leading in the New York Times polling average by a mere 0.4%.

Democrats say Obama will be an asset to Clinton in areas such as Charlotte, where he remains immensely popular with the sizable minority populations.

Moreover, Obama can help Clinton in the Raleigh-Durham area, which is filled with younger, educated white voters that might need prodding to back Clinton after a contentious primary with Sen. Bernie Sanders.

And winning North Carolina would be a good omen for Clinton in November. If she carries the state, there's almost no path for Trump to secure the 270 Electoral College votes necessary for victory.

### 2NC – L – North Carolina – Jobs

#### Trade bashing and promises of jobs gives North Carolina to Trump

Funk 6/10 – (Tim Funk, reporter for the Charlotte Observer covering the 2016 election; 6/10/16, “5 things Donald Trump needs to do to win NC,” *The Charlotte Observer*, <http://www.charlotteobserver.com/news/politics-government/article83117332.html>, Accessed 7/6/16, HWilson)

4. Stage ‘Bring Back Our Jobs’ rallies in former factory towns

Trump’s condemnations of “stupid” trade deals that have closed many American factories could resonate in North Carolina, which has lost thousands of textile and furniture jobs over the years.

Instead of issuing daily insults, the billionaire might win more votes in the state by casting himself as Businessman-in-Chief at blue-collar rallies in places like Concord and Hickory.

And he could remind those in his audience how Clinton recently angered coal miners in West Virginia by saying their jobs were also going away.

“Trump could say ‘The textile workers are like the coal workers and here’s what Hillary Clinton wants to do,’ ” said Susan Roberts, a political scientist at Davidson College. “And that ‘We need to deregulate (business) to bring back jobs.’ ”

## Ohio

### 2NC – UQ – Ohio – Obama Key

#### Ohio is anyone’s game – Trump’s trade-bashing resonates – Obama’s support helps Clinton hang onto a narrow lead

Cahn 6/30 – (Emily Cahn is a senior writer for Mic covering politics, 6/30/16, “4 States Where Barack Obama Can Boost Hillary Clinton's Campaign,” *Policy Mic*, <https://mic.com/articles/147394/4-states-where-barack-obama-can-boost-hillary-clinton-s-campaign#.EL7qIPl9A>, Accessed 7/7/16, HWilson)

Democrats are fired up and ready to unleash President Barack Obama.

Obama will hit the campaign trail on Tuesday in Charlotte, North Carolina — his first joint-appearance with presumptive Democratic presidential nominee Hillary Clinton since he endorsed her earlier this month.

With his approval rating averaging more than 50% for the first time since early 2013, Democrats say Obama will be an asset to their party in the fall. And they are planning to lean on him to help Clinton win in November and cement his presidential legacy.

Yet while Democrats say Obama's popularity will be a boon in November, they add that there are certain places he's most likely to appear as Election Day draws near.

Look for Obama and Clinton to hit suburban areas in swing states. While places such as Arizona and Georgia — traditionally Red states where polls show Clinton within striking distance — might not benefit from a visit from Obama.

"I think that the president can and be an asset pretty much anywhere, but particularly with young people, particularly in swing states he's done well in, and particularly in some of the more suburban areas of these swing states," Shripal Shah, communications director for Senate Majority PAC, a super PAC working to flip the Senate back to Democratic control in November, said. "Those are the people that pretty much built his coalition in '08 and '12, and those are the people who are still persuadable. and he's the the best messenger to persuade them"

Here are the four places where Obama can help Clinton the most.

North Carolina

North Carolina is a firmly purple state, thanks to a growing number of northerners moving to the Tar Heel State due to its thriving economy.

Obama won here in 2008 by less than a one-point margin, and lost four years later by two points.

In 2016, polling in the state shows Clinton and Trump in a virtual tie, with Clinton leading in the New York Times polling average by a mere 0.4%.

Democrats say Obama will be an asset to Clinton in areas such as Charlotte, where he remains immensely popular with the sizable minority populations.

Moreover, Obama can help Clinton in the Raleigh-Durham area, which is filled with younger, educated white voters that might need prodding to back Clinton after a contentious primary with Sen. Bernie Sanders.

And winning North Carolina would be a good omen for Clinton in November. If she carries the state, there's almost no path for Trump to secure the 270 Electoral College votes necessary for victory.

Florida

The Sunshine State is perpetual swing territory.

Obama carried it twice — by a nearly three-point margin in 2008 and by a slim one-point margin in 2012.

Florida's growing Hispanic population makes the state fertile territory in Clinton's race against Trump, who has attacked Mexican immigrants and promised to build a wall across the U.S.-Mexico border.

Democrats say minority-heavy areas in south and central Florida are ripe for Obama to campaign in.

Populous cities such as Orlando, Miami and Tampa are where Democrats build their margins of victory in the state, and where Obama is most likely to campaign in with Clinton.

"I anticipate that he will be really helpful in central Florida, whether it's Tampa or Orlando," said Ana Cruz, former executive director of the Florida Democratic Party. "Remember, back in '08, shortly after Hillary conceded, [one of their first appearances] together was in Orlando, Florida, and it drew huge crowd because of the ... diverse demographics that central Florida has."

Ohio

Both Sanders and Trump have stoked working-class white voters' anger over trade agreements, which they say have led to job losses in Rust Belt states such as Ohio.

It's a message that could help Trump in Ohio — a must-win state in any of his potential paths to 270 Electoral Votes.

Democrats say Obama, who has focused in his final year on a re-negotiated Trans-Pacific Partnership deal, will likely head to the Buckeye State to defend that trade agenda and try to keep those working-class white voters in the Democratic camp.

Places where Obama will likely campaign alongside Clinton in the state to deliver that message include Cleveland, Columbus and Cincinnati — Democratic strongholds where Clinton will look to build her statewide margin.

### 2NC – UQ/Link – Ohio – Trade

#### Concluding a major trade deal would get pinned to Hillary and cause Trump to win Ohio – maintaining an anti-trade stance allows Hillary to win but distancing herself from the plan causes her to lose

Russo 6/27 – (John Russo, formerly co-director of the Center for Working-Class Studies at Youngstown State University, is a visiting scholar at the Kalmanovitz Initiative for Labor and the Working Poor at Georgetown University, 6/27/16, “Hillary Clinton risks losing Ohio and the working class unless she alters her stance on trade: John Russo (Opinion),” <http://www.cleveland.com/opinion/index.ssf/2016/06/hillary_clinton_risks_losing_o.html>, Accessed 6/30/16, HWilson)

In the latest Quinnipiac poll, Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump are tied in battleground Ohio. This suggests a very close race in Ohio in the fall.

Economic issues, especially trade, led many former Democrats to cross party lines to support Trump in the Republican primaries. Many who hadn't voted in recent elections joined them. We're likely to see a repeat of this in November unless Democrats change their trade policies.

None of this should surprise Democrats, especially those in Ohio.

As a professor of labor studies and co-director of the Center for Working-Class Studies at Youngstown State University for more than 30 years, I had many opportunities to talk politics with workers there.

In 2000, many told me that, after voting for Democrats all their lives, they were choosing guns, gays and God over Al Gore, who had been a primary spokesman for the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) seven years earlier.

In 2002, Northeast Ohio Democrats threw out eight-term congressman Tom Sawyer on the basis of his support for NAFTA, despite Sawyer having a 90 percent voting record on labor issues.

Since the passage of NAFTA, Ohio Republicans have controlled state government save for a brief interlude caused by Republican corruption in 2006. At the same time, two Democrats -- Sen. Sherrod Brown and Rep. Tim Ryan, who replaced Sawyer -- have been elected and re-elected in no small part due to their opposition to NAFTA and the pending Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP).

Clearly, trade policy poses a problem for Democrats and their presumptive candidate. Clinton has been tied to former President Bill Clinton's NAFTA legislation and its Wall Street proponents. While she has stated that she is against TPP at this time, many Ohioans hear that as weasel words that only contribute to their distrust of Clinton.

It is widely speculated that the Obama administration will push for TPP acceptance in the lame-duck session following the 2016 general election. According to a tweet from CNN's Dan Merica, Clinton says she will not lobby Congress on the issue. But this will only undermine her credibility and provide Trump with an incentive to continue to demagogue the issue.

In Ohio, about 60 percent of voters in 2012 did not have a college degree, one of the most commonly used (though problematic) proxies for identifying working-class voters. Slightly more than half of them voted for Obama, according to CNN exit polls.

Clinton needs to stop insisting that trade is good.

But while Obama won a majority of working-class votes in Ohio, he lost among whites, winning only 41 percent of their votes. This suggests that a significant portion of Obama's working-class support in 2012 came from Ohio voters of color, not white voters.

Four years later, the combination of white working-class support for Trump, as we saw in the primary, and expected lower African-American turnout -- Clinton is unlikely to inspire the enthusiasm that Obama generated -- may swing Ohio's prized electoral votes to the presumptive Republican nominee.

Clinton needs the support of working-class Ohioans – the very people who have been hurt the most by trade policy. To do that, she needs to stop insisting that trade is good. Her current stance is similar to wooing West Virginia coal miners by touting the benefits of non-carbon fuels.

Similarly, she should stop talking about retraining and promising high-tech jobs, which only reminds voters of how hollow such programs have been in the past.

Instead, Clinton should acknowledge that we have lost the trade war and pledge to use every legal means at her disposal to protect American workers and industries from the continued onslaught of imports. This would include initiating trade cases against countries that target American industries by subsidizing their exports, exploiting workers, manipulating their currencies, and polluting the environment.

She should threaten to impose tariffs on every imported product from countries that refuse to implement the same U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency regulations and federal, state and local tax requirements that are imposed on American businesses.

At the very least, Clinton should do more than promise to build a strong infrastructure program. Such a program would put the skills, materials and physical strength of working-class Ohioans to work and improve Ohio's competitive economic environment. Clinton has identified specific programs but she needs to do more to explain how she will pay for them. Otherwise, her campaign platform will sound too much like an echo of past hollow campaign promises.

Clinton should also stress making college affordable for the working class and those living in poverty. Not everyone wants a desk job in front of a computer, and older workers may not be interested in retraining for high-tech jobs. But they do want more education and training for their kids.

Finally, working people worry about how they will fare economically after retirement. They know that Wall Street oversold 401(k) plans and that traditional pensions are disappearing. Clinton needs to reject Wall Street's calls for changes in Social Security and offer a specific program to maintain private pension plans without cutting benefits.

If Clinton does not develop a strong and believable working-class agenda, I predict that the Democrats will lose Ohio in November, and that would open the door to a Trump victory nationally.

### 2NC – UQ – Dem Win

#### Clinton takes Ohio now – only increased anti-trade rhetoric can get them back on Trump’s side – Ohio’s key to the overall election

Reuters 6/27 – (Reuters is the news and media division of Thomson Reuters. Thomson Reuters is the world's largest international multimedia news agency, providing investing news, world news, business news, technology news, headline news, small business news, news alerts, personal finance, stock market, and mutual funds information; 6./27/16, “In campaign trail debut with Clinton, Warren says Trump driven by greed,” <http://www.swissinfo.ch/eng/reuters/white-house-hopeful-clinton-teams-up-with-liberal-warren-for-ohio-event/42256172>, Accessed 6/30/16, HWilson)

CINCINNATI (Reuters) - Liberal Elizabeth Warren attacked Republican Donald Trump on Monday during her first campaign appearance with U.S. Democratic presidential candidate Hillary Clinton, calling him an "insecure money grubber" who is driven by greed and hate.

Warren, a leader of the Democratic Party's progressive wing and a potential vice presidential pick, said Clinton had spent her career fighting for liberal values while Trump, a wealthy real estate developer, was focused on boosting his bottom line.

The U.S. senator from Massachusetts appeared with Clinton before a raucous, enthusiastic crowd in Cincinnati, Ohio, targeting a battleground state in a potential preview of a Clinton-Warren campaign team. She repeatedly accused Trump of looking out for himself instead of for average Americans.

"When Donald Trump says he'll make America great, he means make it even greater for rich guys just like Donald Trump," Warren said, standing shoulder to shoulder with a cheering Clinton.

Clinton has struggled to win over some liberal backers of rival Bernie Sanders, a democratic socialist U.S. senator from Vermont, since beating him for the Democratic nomination this month. She hopes the support of Warren can help her in that effort as she campaigns against Trump for the Nov. 8 election.

Warren, who has vigorously attacked Trump in recent weeks, called him "a small, insecure money grubber who fights for no one but himself" and warned: "He will crush you into the dirt to get whatever he wants. That's who he is."

The capacity crowd repeatedly roared its approval, and a line of supporters who could not get inside stretched out the door and down the street. At one point, Warren stopped her speech to turn and applaud Clinton, a former secretary of state.

"She knows what it takes to beat a thin-skinned bully who is driven by greed and hate," said Warren, known for calling for reining in Wall Street and eradicating income inequality.

WARREN 'A SELLOUT' - TRUMP

In a statement, Trump called Warren "a sellout" for backing Clinton, who has taken donations from Wall Street interests and once backed the Trans-Pacific Partnership, the Asian trade deal. Clinton has since reversed her trade stance.

In an interview with NBC News, Trump called Warren "a fraud" and "a racist," accusing her of making up claims about her Native American heritage to advance her career.

He again called Warren "Pocahontas," the name of a 17th-century Native American figure, to draw attention to a controversy first raised during Warren's 2012 Senate race in Massachusetts.

"She is one of the least productive senators in the United States Senate," Trump told NBC. "We call her Pocahontas for a reason."

Two other potential Clinton vice presidential picks - U.S. senators Tim Kaine of Virginia and Sherrod Brown of Ohio - rejected Trump's assertion and defended Warren's record.

"That’s what he does, he attacks people. He acts like he’s attacking their character - he’s attacking his own character when he does that," Brown told Reuters.

“You can’t believe anything Donald Trump says. Period," Kaine told Reuters.

OHIO PIVOTAL

Taking the microphone in Ohio, Clinton said she liked Warren's aggressive approach to her Republican rival, who has sprayed rivals and critics with insults throughout his campaign.

"I just love how she gets under Donald Trump's skin," Clinton said.

Clinton's decision to campaign with Warren for the first time in Cincinnati, a city on Ohio's southwestern border with Kentucky and Indiana, underscored the swing state's vital role in the November showdown with Trump.

Ohio has backed every successful presidential nominee since 1964 and no Republican has won the White House without carrying the state.

Warren's calls to rein in corporate excess could resonate with two groups Clinton must court in the election - Sanders supporters and those anxious about the economy who are drawn to Trump's promise to toss out international trade deals.

Ohio's manufacturing base has taken a hit in recent economic slowdowns, and Trump has identified it as a state where his anti-free trade rhetoric could resonate with alienated blue-collar voters.

Since becoming the presumptive Democratic nominee, Clinton has repeatedly tried to portray businessman Trump as fundamentally unfit for the presidency. Clinton said Warren's long history of fighting for progressive economic values made her a perfect messenger for that critique.

#### Clinton ahead in rust belt states but Trump can catch up due to lack of democratic unity

**Stoklos 6/19/**16 -- Eli Stokols is a national politics reporter for POLITICO, currently covering the Republican side of the 2016 presidential election, (“Donald Trump’s path to victory”, available online at <http://www.politico.com/story/2016/06/donald-trump-path-to-victory-224239>, accessed 6/30/16, HDA)

To reach 270, Trump’s team is aiming to capture America’s Rust Belt — specifically, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan and Wisconsin — where polls generally show him performing better than Mitt Romney did at this point in 2012. If he can capture Florida and keep North Carolina — the 2012 red state of the lightest hue — a strong showing that includes capture of the Rust Belt could, Trump’s team believes, put him over the top. But the odds are long, veteran strategists said. “It’s a fantasy. Romney got 19 percent of nonwhites. Is Trump going to do better? I don’t think so,” said Stuart Stevens, Romney’s 2012 campaign strategist. “It’s a joke. It’s just talking. It has no grounding in reality.” Trump, however, is looking even farther afield. He is talking up his chances in states like New York and California and making tactical moves aimed at boosting his support in states no Republican presidential hopeful has won since the 1980s. Despite being the only candidate left standing in the GOP field, Trump campaigned for three weeks in California, contending that he can take the state’s 55 electoral votes away from Hillary Clinton in November. And while his campaign has yet to hire a state director in Ohio, Trump recently brought on John McLaughlin, a New York pollster, to help him win his home state — even though polls show Clinton ahead by more than 20 percentage points, according to the RealClearPolitics average. On Thursday, Trump reportedly told donors during a meeting that he thinks he can put New Jersey and Maryland in play as well. Plus, a super PAC backing him is tossing money into national cable ads rather than targeting voters in the battlegrounds. But the consensus of the Republican political and polling world outside Trump Tower is that he cannot expect to make such dramatic inroads; most pollsters say this unpredictable election cycle has not changed the fundamental electoral math, even as it has taught the most seasoned observers to expect the unexpected. “Never in modern history have we seen two nominees who have an unfavorable rating over 50 percent,” said Ed Goeas, a Republican pollster in Washington. “We’re truly in uncharted waters trying to use history to determine what’s going to happen in this campaign.” Those close to his campaign privately say Trump’s pronouncements about turning some strongly Democratic states is essentially an old-fashioned head fake — an effort to raise money while forcing Clinton’s team to spend its own defending safe territory. “He’s just poking and prodding to see if he can put [California] in play,” said one operative who works closely with the campaign. “He doesn’t have to win but would love to make her spend some money and time there.” But he will need to outperform Romney to win, and there is no underestimating the difficulty of that task. With the exception of Wisconsin, where Trump suffered one of his worst primary losses, the Rust Belt states his team has identified appear to be competitive, although current polls are somewhat misleading, taken at a moment when Clinton has yet to bring home disaffected Bernie Sanders supporters. Trump, on the other hand, has been attempting to unify Republicans for more than a month. “Right now, Pennsylvania, Ohio and Florida look very close because she’s having a hard time getting Sanders supporters on board,” said Tom Jensen, director of Public Policy Polling, whose most recent surveys show Clinton with a lead of 1 percentage point over Trump in Pennsylvania and a 3-point edge in Ohio. “Republicans are more unified right now than Democrats,” he continued. “Trump’s lead with Republicans [in Pennsylvania] was 12 points bigger than her lead with Democrats, but it remains to be seen if that can be sustained. One thing we saw is that 72 percent of Sanders supporters say they’d vote for Clinton over Trump — and if she gets just half of them, her lead balloons to around 6 or 7 points.”

#### Clinton will win Ohio but it will be close.

Balmert 6/21 [Jessie Balmert, Reporter covering state government and the 2016 Election for The Enquirer, (“Latest poll: Clinton, Trump tied in Ohio,” Cincinnati, http://www.cincinnati.com/story/news/politics/blogs/2016/06/21/latest-poll-clinton-trump-tied-ohio/86168844/, Accessed 06-30-2016, ??)]

COLUMBUS - Presumptive GOP nominee Donald Trump and Democrat Hillary Clinton are in a dead heat for Ohio's votes in the all-important swing state, according to a Quinnipiac University poll released Tuesday. Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump are in a dead heat Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump are in a dead heat for Ohio votes. (Photo: AP) **Both would receive about 40 percent of the vote**, according to the most recent poll, which comes one month after polling showed Trump had a slight edge over Clinton in the Buckeye State. CINCINNATI.COM Poll: Trump edges Clinton in Ohio in battle of unpopular candidates In the past month, Trump has suffered some self-inflicted wounds, including attacking a federal judge of Mexican descent and doubling down on a ban on Muslims following the shootings at an Orlando gay club. **Clinton has slightly more support from Ohio Democrats – 80 percent would vote for her – than Trump has among the state's Republican voters, 76 percent** of whom **would vote for Trump**. Quinnipiac also polled in Florida and Pennsylvania. "The at-times bitter verbal battles between Trump and some Republicans leaders is showing in these numbers," said Peter Brown, assistant director of the Quinnipiac Poll, in a statement. "In these three key states, Clinton is doing better, and in the case of Florida much better, among Democrats than Trump is among Republicans. **Traditionally GOP presidential candidates score better on this party loyalty test**." About 59 percent of Ohioans said Trump's comments about the federal judge overseeing his Trump University case were racist, but 33 percent disagreed. Both nominees remain unpopular with Ohioans. They were tied with 59 percent of voters polled saying they had an unfavorable view of either candidate. In comparison, 40 percent of Ohioans had an unfavorable view of Democrat Bernie Sanders, who would lead Trump 48 percent to 38 percent head-to-head in Ohio, according to the poll. Ohioans thought Clinton was better prepared to be president, had higher moral standards and was more intelligent than her GOP rival. But they thought Trump was more honest, more inspiring and a stronger leader. Trump would be the better guest for a backyard barbecue, but Clinton would be more helpful in a personal crisis.

#### Trump will win Ohio—Sandusky county is a good indicator

Lanka 6/15 --- Benjamin Lanka, writer for Gannett Ohio, 2016 (“Poll: Trump leads Clinton in key Ohio county,” WKYC, June 15, Available Online at <http://www.wkyc.com/news/politics/elections/poll-trump-leads-clinton-in-key-ohio-county/245062945>, Accessed on 06-30-2016, ES)

New poll data shows Donald Trump leading Hillary Clinton in the presidential race in Sandusky County, which a polling firm has selected as one of the key bellwether counties in the nation.

The poll, conducted by Axiom Strategies, shows the presumptive Republican nominee leading the presumptive Democratic nominee 39 percent to 34 percent with Libertarian Gary Johnson collecting 8 percent in the county located near Lake Erie and home to Fremont. The lead is just outside the poll's margin of error of plus or minus 4 percent. Both candidates, however, must battle large unfavorable opinions in the county with 46 percent of respondents having an unfavorable opinion of Trump and 54 percent having an unfavorable opinion of Clinton.

Half of respondents said they believed Clinton's past record is more damaging than Trump's.

In fact, of the seven counties identified by the firm - all in different key swing states - Trump had leads in five of them.

According to the firm, the counties were selected because they historically have been indicators for statewide presidential results. They analyzed returns starting in 2000 to select the areas by matching overall statewide results of presidential elections with county results. In Sandusky County, for example, the county results for the 2012 and 2008 elections were within one percentage point for both the Republican and Democratic candidates.

### 2NC – AT: No Campaign Manager

#### Trump has a campaign manager now—he can get his act together

Thompson 6/23 --- Chrissie Thompson, Cincinnati Enquirer writer, 2016 (“Donald Trump finally hires Ohio campaign manager,” Cincinnati Enquirer, June 23, Available Online at <http://www.cincinnati.com/story/news/politics/2016/06/23/donald-trump-finally-hires-ohio-campaign-manager/86296074/>, Accessed on 06-30-16, ES)

Donald Trump finally has a campaign manager in Ohio.

Bob Paduchik, who ran George W. Bush's two successful presidential efforts in Ohio, will serve as state director for the presumptive GOP nominee. Paduchik had worked for former Florida Gov. Jeb Bush’s campaign during the 2016 primary.

The hire comes more than a month after Democrat Hillary Clinton set up her campaign staff in Ohio. Clinton has jumped out to a head start in Ohio, visiting the state twice in the last two weeks, planning a trip to Cincinnati next week, and fundraising and running commercials in the swing state.

Trump's delay in organizing a campaign in Ohio stems in part from the reticence of many top operatives to back the controversial billionaire. Most Ohio Republican politicos backed Ohio Gov. John Kasich, who ran against Trump for the Republican nomination and has yet to endorse him.

“Mr. Trump ran a great campaign, and he won,” Paduchik said. “I’ve been a Republican all my life. I’m happy to support Mr. Trump, the Republican nominee."

Paduchik, 49, said he doesn't feel the campaign is behind schedule, based on his experience in 2000 and 2004 on the Bush campaign.

### 2NC – Link – Ohio – Trade

#### Increased China bashing could cause Ohio to swing

Chon 6/29 – (Gina Chon, contributor, Reuters BreakingViews; 6/29/16, “Trump’s new strategy: Label Clinton a Republican,” <http://www.cnbc.com/2016/06/29/trumps-new-strategy-label-clinton-a-republican-commentary.html>, Accessed 6/30/16, HWilson)

U.S. presidential contender Donald Trump has a new strategy: He's labeling Democrat Hillary Clinton a Republican. In a speech Tuesday, the real-estate mogul who won the Republican primaries blasted trade deals with Mexico and Japan and accused the former secretary of state of supporting pacts that hurt American workers. That puts Clinton more in line with the GOP. It's an attempt to woo voters on the other side of the fence who still back Democratic Senator Bernie Sanders of Vermont.

Trump has been trying to appeal to what he calls the shrinking middle class by criticizing globalization. He wants to scrap the Trans-Pacific Partnership involving 12 Pacific Rim countries. That's the same position held by Sanders, who said he would do all he can to ensure Trump loses but has not dropped out of the Democratic race. Trump also wants to renegotiate the North American Free Trade Agreement, which was pushed under Bill Clinton's administration.

The strategy could resonate with voters in key swing states like Ohio and Pennsylvania. Those regions have been hurt more by the 5 million manufacturing jobs that have been lost in the United States over the last 15 years. Unemployment rates are higher than the national figure of 4.7 percent, with Ohio at 5.1 percent and Pennsylvania at 5.5 percent. Trump gave his speech in the rust belt of Pennsylvania, citing the loss of steel jobs in nearby Pittsburgh to China.

Clinton has been more supportive of trade. Besides backing NAFTA, she also supported TPP until Sanders made it an issue in the Democratic primaries. Other liberals like Massachusetts Senator Elizabeth Warren reject the deal, which is supported by most Republican lawmakers and President Barack Obama. Trump threw Sanders's words back at Clinton, quoting him as saying she has voted "for virtually every trade agreement that has cost the workers of this country millions of jobs."

Trump's trade stance puts him at odds with a central tenet of the Republican establishment. Indeed, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce – a pro-business organization that almost always backs the GOP – publicly rebuked his position on Tuesday. That follows moves by prominent Republicans like former Treasury Secretary Hank Paulson to publicly back Clinton. The pressure by Sanders has already forced Clinton to backtrack on her support of TPP. Trump is simply carrying the baton in Democratic fashion.

#### Trump can win Ohio if he solidifies his base, and certainty on manufacturing can do that.

Thompson 6-29-16 — Chrissie Thompson, local politics reporter, 2016 ("Can Donald Trump win Ohio with slightly tweaked message?," Cincinnati, 6-29-2016, http://www.cincinnati.com/story/news/politics/elections/2016/06/28/can-donald-trump-win-ohio-rape-tpp-muslim-immigration/86481608/, date accessed 6-30-2016, EAKJ)

ST. CLAIRSVILLE - Donald Trump dipped into Ohio Tuesday, bringing to the quintessential swing state the same message and tone he used when he campaigned unsuccessfully for the state’s GOP primary nod – but with a few subtle tweaks. Trump, the presumptive Republican nominee, referred to the proposed Trans-Pacific Partnership trade deal as “a rape of our country.” He praised the benefits of waterboarding against suspected terrorists of the Islamic State, arguing the U.S. must “fight fire with fire.” He extolled the beauty and size of his planned wall on the Mexican border, prompting the crowd’s standard “Build a wall! Build a wall!” chant. But parts of Trump’s message have changed a little in recent days, amid pleas from Republican leaders to tone it down and a scramble from his campaign to build a national operation. USA TODAY Donald Trump targets globalization and free trade as job-killers He’s giving more policy speeches, such as an address earlier Tuesday against globalization and trade deals. So wonky trade details, such as a reference to the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, popped up later that day amid his standard rally material, much to the disinterest of the crowd of around 2,000. He worked in a request for donations: “DonaldJTrump.com,” he added. He has backed off his plan to ban immigration by all Muslims, instead making several vague comments about screening or banning immigrants from countries where terrorists live. On Tuesday, he insisted, without giving documentation, that it was easier for Syrian Muslims to come to the U.S. as compared with Syrian Christians. One person started to boo. But then, as if seeking to ward off critiques accusing him of an anti-Muslim or xenophobic bent, he said: “I’m not saying one or the other (religion). I’m saying, how unfair is that? How bad is that?” He took a similar approach when he referred to the TPP as “rape.” “That’s what it is, too. It’s a harsh word,” he said, preemptively responding to criticism of his comparison of a violent crime to a trade deal. To win Ohio – and no Republican has made it to the White House without the Buckeye State – Trump must win over GOP voters who were wary of his controversial comments or positions. He lost the state’s primary in March to Ohio Gov. John Kasich, as many voters said they wanted to do their part to stop the billionaire’s march to the nomination. Many Ohio Republicans now say they dislike Trump’s presumptive opponent, Democrat Hillary Clinton, but haven’t decided whether they can stomach a vote for Trump in November. Both Larry Waltz and Ashley Cochran referred to their choice in November as “the lesser of two evils.” Waltz, 74, who usually votes Republican, told a reporter driving through his hometown of Zanesville he hadn’t decided who would win his vote. Cochran, 28, has chosen Trump and drove from nearby Bridgeport to attend his rally at Ohio University Eastern’s campus. “I like people who think with their brain,” Cochran said, and Trump may be able to “actually fix things” in the economy. CINCINNATI.COM Donald Trump is coming to Cincy for $25,000-per-person fundraiser Trump chose for his first visit since the primary an area of Ohio where he prevailed over Kasich: Belmont County, just across the Ohio River from West Virginia. The real estate mogul is hoping to gain an advantage over Clinton by keeping Appalachian voters in November. Belmont County, for instance, voted Republican in the 2012 presidential race, but voted solidly Democratic for decades before then, including for former President Bill Clinton. Clinton, on the other hand, has focused her first visits on each of the swing state’s major cities, hoping to win over millions of moderate and Democratic voters to outweigh Trump’s possible advantage in rural and Appalachian Ohio. Still, Clinton’s supporters aren’t conceding Appalachia. “Secretary Clinton understands we need investment in southeast Ohio. There’s no magic wand to fix this,” U.S. Sen. Sherrod Brown, D-Ohio, told reporters earlier Tuesday on a conference call. “Donald Trump will say he’s going to bring back all these manufacturing jobs. He has no plan to do it.” CINCINNATI.COM How Elizabeth Warren attacked Donald Trump at Hillary Clinton rally in Cincinnati In his Tuesday speech on trade, Trump vowed to reject the proposed TPP trade deal with Pacific Rim nations and renegotiate the North American Free Trade Agreement with Canada and Mexico, withdrawing from it if necessary. Later, he addressed a St. Clairsville crowd filled with people who had driven across the river from Wheeling, West Virginia, a historic manufacturing town. As president, Trump said he would call companies considering moving American factory work to Mexico. If his proposals were to prevail, he would remind CEOs their Mexican-made goods would face a tariff upon being imported into the United States. “It doesn’t work that way anymore. We’re not the stupid people anymore,” Trump said, imagining what he would say as president. Then, he said, to cheers from the working-class crowd: “I’m not angry at Japan. I’m not angry at China. I’m angry at our leaders, who are so stupid.”

## Pennsylvania

### 2NC – UQ – Pennsylvania

#### Clinton has a slight lead in Pennsylvania right now, but it’s exceptionally close

Easley 6/28 – (Jonathan Easley is a reporter covering the election for The Hill, 6/28/16, “Polls show tight Clinton-Trump race in 2016 battlegrounds,” *The Hill*, <http://thehill.com/homenews/campaign/285083-polls-show-tight-race-for-white-house-in-battleground-states>, Accessed 7/7/16, HWilson)

Pennsylvania is the battleground giving Democrats the most heartburn.

Its 20 electoral votes have not gone to the GOP nominee in almost 30 years, yet a Public Policy Polling survey of the state released this month found Trump and Clinton tied, while a Quinnipiac University poll showed Clinton ahead by only 1 point. Analysts at the University of Virginia’s Center for Politics recently shifted Pennsylvania from “Likely Democratic” to “Leans Democratic.”

Trump on Tuesday will look to build on his advantage with working class white voters in the state with a speech from Monessen, a steel mill town an hour south of Pittsburgh that is trying to revitalize itself.

Clinton’s allies, meanwhile, are now pouring millions of dollars into a state where they never expected to have to compete.

#### It’s neck and neck – trade resonates with voters – Obama’s support helps Clinton cling to a lead

Cahn 6/30 – (Emily Cahn is a senior writer for Mic covering politics, 6/30/16, “4 States Where Barack Obama Can Boost Hillary Clinton's Campaign,” *Policy Mic*, <https://mic.com/articles/147394/4-states-where-barack-obama-can-boost-hillary-clinton-s-campaign#.EL7qIPl9A>, Accessed 7/7/16, HWilson)

Democrats are fired up and ready to unleash President Barack Obama.

Obama will hit the campaign trail on Tuesday in Charlotte, North Carolina — his first joint-appearance with presumptive Democratic presidential nominee Hillary Clinton since he endorsed her earlier this month.

With his approval rating averaging more than 50% for the first time since early 2013, Democrats say Obama will be an asset to their party in the fall. And they are planning to lean on him to help Clinton win in November and cement his presidential legacy.

Yet while Democrats say Obama's popularity will be a boon in November, they add that there are certain places he's most likely to appear as Election Day draws near.

Look for Obama and Clinton to hit suburban areas in swing states. While places such as Arizona and Georgia — traditionally Red states where polls show Clinton within striking distance — might not benefit from a visit from Obama.

"I think that the president can and be an asset pretty much anywhere, but particularly with young people, particularly in swing states he's done well in, and particularly in some of the more suburban areas of these swing states," Shripal Shah, communications director for Senate Majority PAC, a super PAC working to flip the Senate back to Democratic control in November, said. "Those are the people that pretty much built his coalition in '08 and '12, and those are the people who are still persuadable. and he's the the best messenger to persuade them"

Here are the four places where Obama can help Clinton the most.

North Carolina

North Carolina is a firmly purple state, thanks to a growing number of northerners moving to the Tar Heel State due to its thriving economy.

Obama won here in 2008 by less than a one-point margin, and lost four years later by two points.

In 2016, polling in the state shows Clinton and Trump in a virtual tie, with Clinton leading in the New York Times polling average by a mere 0.4%.

Democrats say Obama will be an asset to Clinton in areas such as Charlotte, where he remains immensely popular with the sizable minority populations.

Moreover, Obama can help Clinton in the Raleigh-Durham area, which is filled with younger, educated white voters that might need prodding to back Clinton after a contentious primary with Sen. Bernie Sanders.

And winning North Carolina would be a good omen for Clinton in November. If she carries the state, there's almost no path for Trump to secure the 270 Electoral College votes necessary for victory.

Florida

The Sunshine State is perpetual swing territory.

Obama carried it twice — by a nearly three-point margin in 2008 and by a slim one-point margin in 2012.

Florida's growing Hispanic population makes the state fertile territory in Clinton's race against Trump, who has attacked Mexican immigrants and promised to build a wall across the U.S.-Mexico border.

Democrats say minority-heavy areas in south and central Florida are ripe for Obama to campaign in.

Populous cities such as Orlando, Miami and Tampa are where Democrats build their margins of victory in the state, and where Obama is most likely to campaign in with Clinton.

"I anticipate that he will be really helpful in central Florida, whether it's Tampa or Orlando," said Ana Cruz, former executive director of the Florida Democratic Party. "Remember, back in '08, shortly after Hillary conceded, [one of their first appearances] together was in Orlando, Florida, and it drew huge crowd because of the ... diverse demographics that central Florida has."

Ohio

Both Sanders and Trump have stoked working-class white voters' anger over trade agreements, which they say have led to job losses in Rust Belt states such as Ohio.

It's a message that could help Trump in Ohio — a must-win state in any of his potential paths to 270 Electoral Votes.

Democrats say Obama, who has focused in his final year on a re-negotiated Trans-Pacific Partnership deal, will likely head to the Buckeye State to defend that trade agenda and try to keep those working-class white voters in the Democratic camp.

Places where Obama will likely campaign alongside Clinton in the state to deliver that message include Cleveland, Columbus and Cincinnati — Democratic strongholds where Clinton will look to build her statewide margin.

Pennsylvania

Pennsylvania hasn't gone Republican in a presidential election since 1988.

Yet polling shows the race is neck-in-neck, with Clinton leading Trump by just 1.9 points, according to the New York Times polling average.

As in Ohio, that close margin is likely thanks to working-class white voters in western Pennsylvania, an area that was once a draw for manufacturing, but has seen jobs dry up in the past few decades.

Democrats will likely look to Philadelphia and its outlying suburbs to counteract any losses among that demographic bloc. It's an area where Obama remains popular, and where Democrats could likely dispatch him if polling stays as lose as it is.

"He remains an immensely popular president in a number of different areas of this state," said Pennsylvania-based Democratic strategist Michael Bronstein, mentioning Philadelphia and its suburbs as places where Obama remains particularly popular. "And as a campaigner, he is an asset for Secretary Clinton's presidential campaign, and will be treated like the rock star that he is if he comes to Pennsylvania."

#### Clinton and Trump are functionally tied – any slip-ups mean a Florida loss

Catanese 6/10 – (David Catanese is senior politics writer for U.S. News & World Report and founder of the blog The Run 2016, 6/10/16, “As General Election Begins, Clinton Holds a Narrow Edge Over Trump,” *U.S. News*, <http://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2016-06-10/clinton-begins-general-election-with-narrow-edge-over-unpredictable-trump>, Accessed 7/6/16, HWilson)

With just under five months until Americans pick a new president, Hillary Clinton begins the 2016 general election campaign holding a slim advantage over Donald Trump, who has surprisingly kept pace with the presumptive Democratic nominee while weathering a cyclone of strife within the Republican Party.

The New York City billionaire essentially wrapped up the GOP nomination five weeks ago, but failed to reap the benefit of a monthlong head start against Clinton, who became the first woman to clinch a major party's presidential bid earlier this week.

Clinton Captures Big Endorsements

While Clinton's attention was divided by having to fend off Sen. Bernie Sanders of Vermont, Trump could've used the time to build out his team, broaden his organizational presence in swing states, cultivate relationships with reluctant donors and sharpen his case against the former secretary of state.

Instead, he ensnared himself in a racially charged controversy in defending the now-defunct Trump University while his campaign leadership experienced a turbulent stint of skirmishes that prompted the firing of its political director. On top of that, many of his former Republican rivals remain uncommitted to his candidacy and other prominent conservatives are running away from it. The Grand Old Party has not yet fully come to terms with its standard-bearer.

Even so, Trump remarkably remains in the game – a byproduct of a highly polarized country forced to choose between two widely known but highly disliked candidates who are shouldering considerable baggage.

"Given all the trouble Trump has caused, and a lot of it for himself . . . he is still pretty close in the polls," Bill Bennett, a former secretary of education under President Ronald Reagan, said Wednesday evening on Fox News.

A pair of surveys taken last weekend in the battleground states of Florida and Pennsylvania prove the case. In Pennsylvania – a state Republicans haven't carried in a presidential election since 1988 – Clinton is ahead of Trump by only a single point, according to the Democratic-leaning Public Policy Polling.

In Florida, the third-most populous state with 29 electoral votes, Public Policy Polling tracked Trump edging Clinton by just 1 point.

### 2NC – L – Pennsylvania – Trade

#### Trade-bashing resonates deeply in Pennsylvania – it’ll be crucial

Jackson 6/28 – (David, journalist for USA today, 6/28/16, “Donald Trump targets globalization and free trade as job-killers,” *USA Today*, <http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/elections/2016/06/28/donald-trump-globalization-trade-pennsylvania-ohio/86431376/>, Accessed 7/7/16, HWilson)

MONESSEN, Pa. — While attacking Hillary Clinton and other career politicians, Donald Trump took aim Tuesday at two other prominent election targets: globalization and free trade.

"Globalization has made the financial elite who donate to politicians very, very wealthy ... but it has left millions of our workers with nothing but poverty and heartache," Trump told supporters during a prepared speech targeting free trade in a nearly-shuttered former steel town in Pennsylvania.

In a speech devoted to what he called "How To Make America Wealthy Again," Trump offered a series of familiar plans designed to deal with what he called "failed trade policies" — including rejection of the proposed Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) with Pacific Rim nations and re-negotiation of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) with Canada and Mexico, withdrawing from it if necessary.

The presumptive Republican presidential nominee also said he would pursue bilateral trade agreements rather than multi-national deals like TPP and NAFTA.

In addition to appointing better trade negotiators and stepping up punishment of countries that violate trade rules, Trump's plans would also target one specific economic competitor: China. He vowed to label China a currency manipulator, bring it before the World Trade Organization and consider slapping tariffs on Chinese imports coming into the U.S.

Clinton and other politicians, meanwhile, "watched on the sidelines as our jobs vanished and our communities were plunged into depression-level unemployment," Trump said in a dusty old aluminum plant in Monessen, part of what was once known as "The Steel Valley" along the Monongahela River.

Echoing his mantra of "America First," Trump vowed to use only American steel — and aluminum — on U.S. road, bridge, and construction projects, employing only American workers.

Trump attacked both Clinton and her husband, former president Bill Clinton, for past support of trade deals, including TPP. He also hit them over China's admission to the World Trade Organization.

Hillary Clinton says she now opposes the Pacific Rim trade agreement and other "bad trade deals" that are hurting U.S. workers. Pledging to appoint a "trade prosecutor" during a speech in Ohio this week, Clinton vowed to go after "unfair trade practices like when China dumps cheap steel in our markets or uses weak rules of origin to undercut our car makers."

A prominent Clinton supporter — Sen. Sherrod Brown of Ohio — called Trump a hypocrite, saying he has benefited from trade deals that have helped him sponsor clothing lines made in other countries. While Clinton has offered a “detailed plan to boost American manufacturing," Brown said Trump has "high-priced accountants" who are "cashing checks from products that he’s had manufactured in other countries.”

During his speech in a warehouse stacked with pallets of aluminum parts, Trump said Clinton came out against the Trans-Pacific Partnership only "when she saw my stance," and predicted that she would still sign the trade pact if elected to office.

"Her whole career, she has betrayed the American worker," Trump said.

Trump also pushed the trade issue at a rally Tuesday evening in St. Clairsville, Ohio, near the coal-rich West Virginia state line.

Speaking to fans at the Ohio University Eastern Campus, Trump said China and other countries are taking advantage of the United States. "They're just not treating us right, folks," he said.

Trump also described the proposed Trans-Pacific Partnership trade deal as "a rape of our country" by special interests.

Trade and other global issues are resonating in blue-collar areas of Pennsylvania and Michigan, states that have gone Democratic in six straight presidential elections, as well as Ohio, generally considered a must-win for any Republican candidate.

Trump "talks about the economy only in the language of globalization," said Daniel W. Drezner, professor of international politics at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University. "It's globalization that's wrecking the American economy, and that's how I'm going to fix it," he said of Trump's rhetoric.

Drezner added: "It's a question as to whether people will actually vote on that."

In western Pennsylvania, people have "endured incredible economic hardship" as manufacturing jobs move overseas, said Joseph DiSarro, who chairs the political science department at Washington & Jefferson College in Washington, Pa. Trump's message is well-received there, DiSarro said, adding that "globalization has really brought on unfair competition to the American worker" as businesses move jobs to low-wage, low-regulated countries.

In addition to the impact of globalization on trade, Trump has also criticized aspects of multi-lateral alliances like NATO and has said that European and Asian nations are not paying enough for U.S. defense assistance.

Analysts said that Trump tends to ignore the benefits of a globalized economy, including easier and increased movement of goods and services across borders that leads to greater selection and cheaper prices for consumers. The loss of manufacturing and industrial jobs owe more to automation — machines — than trade, Drezner said.

International alliances, meanwhile, have helped keep the peace.

Clinton has said that other countries would retaliate against Trump's plans, leading to higher taxes and prices for U.S. consumers: “There’s a difference between getting tough on trade, and recklessly starting trade wars. The last time we opted for Trump-style isolationism, it made the Great Depression longer and more painful.”

Trump aides say last week's vote in the United Kingdom to leave the European Union is another sign that people across the world are rebelling against globalization.

Trump's speech in Pennsylvania found a receptive audience among many of the invited guests, many of them local Republicans.

"I think we should not allow our companies to manufacture overseas," said Carol Jacobelli, 75, a retired tax accountant from Trafford, Pa. "I hope Trump can find ways to stop it."

Emily Zboyovsky, 76, a retired real estate broker and lifelong resident of Monessen, said free trade is only one problem. Ineffective politicians and bad policies have also helped shutter steel towns, she said, adding that she likes Trump "because he's not obligated to anybody."

Former Republican presidential candidate Rick Santorum, who also attended the speech, predicted "a lot of Democrats" in depressed areas of Pennsylvania and beyond will respond to Trump's message, both about trade and Clinton.

"She is a globalist," he said.

# Affirmative

## Uniqueness – General

### 2AC – Clinton Win Inev

#### Uniqueness overwhelms the link – no way that Trump can win

Schneider 7-5 – Christian Schneider, columnist and blogger for the Milwaukee-Wisconsin Journal Sentinel, 2016 (“No matter how you look at it, Trump's not winning: Column”, USA Today, Available online at <http://www.usatoday.com/story/opinion/nation-now/2016/07/05/no-matter-how-you-look-trumps-not-winning-column/86715020/>, Accessed on 07-07-2016, KG)

Amid the incessant din of election-year punditry and prognostication, one fact reigns supreme: Republicans vote for Republicans and Democrats vote for Democrats. It is an inescapable truth that informs 90% of races; the more members of one party that reside in any given state or district, the better chance a politician of that party will win. It is why America is freckled with "red" and "blue" states and "safe" congressional seats. It is also why American presidential races are typically close, regardless of who the candidates may be. But 2016 is no typical year. Republicans have nominated a candidate who is only recently and tangentially Republican, and whose staunchest supporters are left to argue he is fit for the presidency only because his Democratic opponent is more unfit. It has long been clear that Donald Trump's party fluidity almost certainly will spell doom for Republicans in November. Trump hurdled the GOP primary field because he said things politicians could never say — and now Republicans are going to learn the hard way why politicians never say those things. Trump is now the Bruce Willis character in "The Sixth Sense": his candidacy is dead, he just doesn't realize it yet. (Sorry for the spoiler, but c'mon — it's been 17 years.) The myriad ways Trump's candidacy will fail provide a Rashomon-style buffet of scenarios to contemplate. Even if "Generic Republican" were on the ballot, he or she would be at a distinct electoral disadvantage — Trump's repulsiveness simply accelerates that disadvantage. (If anyone has a black and white "Generic Republican" yard sign, decorated with a UPC bar code, I will happily purchase one.) As Chris Cillizza of the Washington Post frequently points out, given the GOP's built-in underdog status, Hillary Clinton only needs to win every state Democrats have won in every presidential election since 1992, then add Florida, and she is the winner. Perhaps you enjoy talk of battleground states. Well, there's a scenario for you, too. First, pick the six "closest" swing states (VA, NH, IA, OH, FL, NC). Got it? Now understand that New Hampshire excepted, Clinton only has to win one of them in order to reach the requisite 270 electoral votes to win. (Optional third step for Republicans only: start shotgunning Pabst Blue Ribbon and don't stop until November.) Lest any Trump supporters seek solace in poll numbers, recent polls have Trump sliding further behind in all the relevant swing states. According to a Ballotpedia battleground poll released last week, Trump trails by 14% in Florida, 4% in Iowa, 10% in North Carolina, 9% in Ohio, and 7% in Virginia. And what will Trump do to turn these numbers around? Maybe his vice presidential pick will make a big splash? Not so fast. Trump is reportedly considering names such as former Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich and New Jersey Gov. Chris Christie as his running mate — meaning the sole qualification Trump seeks in a VP is how much of Trump's boot polish the pick has on his sleeves. Both Gingrich and Christie are among the least popular politicians in America — picking either of them to resurrect a campaign is like going to a doctor for pinkeye and the doctor suggesting you contract jock itch to take your mind off your conjunctivitis. This is why some Republicans could make a move to oust Trump at the party's national convention in Cleveland this month, in a desperate attempt to salvage the party's chance at winning in November. But at this point, Trump isn't really a candidate. He is an idea, an ethos. Trump is a primal scream against politicians who didn't listen to voters who now want payback. Thus, even if the GOP were able to boot Trump from the top of the ticket, "Trumpism" would remain, poisoning the party and dividing its voters. As Thomas Dewey once said of banning communism, "you can't shoot an idea with a gun." And in 2016, Republicans found a way to commit suicide using only the ballot box.

#### Extremely low chance that Trump wins – Clinton has numerous structural factors on her side

Willis 7-3 – Oliver Willis, research fellow at Media Matters for America, 2016 (“Confidence Isn’t Complacency: Democrats Shouldn’t Be Afraid To Say & Believe Clinton Will Crush Trump”, Oliver Willis, Available online at <http://oliverwillis.com/confidence-isnt-complacency-democrats-shouldnt-afraid-say-believe-clinton-will-crush-trump/>, Accessed on 7-07-2016, KG)

The odds are strongly in favor of Hillary Clinton absolutely crushing Donald Trump in this fall’s presidential election. She leads him in polling, organization, fundraising, and in about a thousand other head to head factors. Clinton also has the advantage of being a Democrat, the party that has excelled at presidential elections. In five out of the last six presidential contests, the Democratic nominee has received a plurality of the votes and outright electoral and popular vote majorities in the two most recent contests. As a Democrat, Clinton is likely to immediately win a majority of states with the most electoral votes. This includes California, New York and Illinois. Her party has also tended to win four out of the five states with the largest electoral college haul. Clinton will be campaigning with a president with an approval rating over 51%, while none of Trump’s predecessors for the Republican nominee will probably campaign with him, and the most recent nominee actively opposes him. If George W. Bush did campaign with Trump, he would probably be hurt by the exercise, not helped. It is against this backdrop of dominance that I encounter, on a daily basis, liberals who are constantly wetting the bed. Frankly, I don’t understand it. It isn’t that I’m saying Clinton can’t possibly lose. But a dispassionate look at recent history, the state of the campaign, and Donald Trump’s unique positioning as someone directly opposed to the base values of the Democratic Party and its voters does not bode well for his chances. There isn’t anything wrong with acknowledging this, saying it, and taking it as your dominant attitude heading into the election. When Michael Jordan was at the height of his basketball prowess, he didn’t go into the NBA Finals telling his teammates they “might” win or that he “hoped” it would work out. He went into those games knowing he was the best basketball – perhaps even athlete – in the entire known world. And then he performed up to that level of expectation. When the allies landed on the beaches of Normandy in World War II, despite the war juggernaut Hitler had demonstrated thus far, they didn’t say they “hoped” the D-Day landing would work, nor did they hedge, hem, and haw about the mission at hand – smashing the Nazi machine. They went in, knowing that they would win and would prevail, because they had to. There isn’t any serious person on the left that thinks about the task against Trump as “in the bag,” to the point where they aren’t ready to show up on November 8, 2016, with anything less than the intention to beat Donald Trump’s rear end from coast to coast. We know he’s a misogynist who is appealing to the worst racist and fascist elements in America in a way we haven’t seen this blatantly in decades. We’re well aware of the downside of a Trump victory, and there isn’t anyone with an ounce of seriousness on the left who thinks that huge issues aren’t at stake – choice, the Supreme Court, health care, immigration, national security – and on and on. But we also know that the likelihood of victory is on our side, and we should stop acting like a gaggle of Eeyores, constantly beating ourselves up and rending garments like we’re down by 20 percentage points. In reality we’re far closer to being on the winning side of an epic landslide that metaphorically punches hate, racism, misogyny, ignorance and a million other qualities emblematic of the worst of America right in its stupid face. And we should act like it. Act like a winner, and be a winner. Don’t act like a loser when you’re winning. Trump is going to be toast, let’s get on with it.

#### Clinton has so much momentum that not even a future scandal could stop her from winning

Linker 7/6 – (Damon Linker is a senior correspondent at TheWeek.com and a consulting editor at the University of Pennsylvania Press; 7/6/16, “Why no Clinton scandal can stop Hillary from crushing Trump,” *The Week*, <http://theweek.com/articles/634062/why-no-clinton-scandal-stop-hillary-from-crushing-trump?utm_source=ten_things&utm_medium=most-popular_1_07_07_16-09_40_13&utm_campaign=newsletter>, Accessed 7/7/16, HWilson)

For just about any other candidate facing just about any other opponent, this would be hugely, perhaps catastrophically, damaging. But Clinton has the great good fortune to be facing Trump. An indictment may well have sunk her. But short of that? She's home free.

Criticism of Clinton is voluminous and well warranted. But Team Clinton has an unspoken, subliminal message to counter critiques of its candidate's lousy record: "Yes, but Trump is worse!"

This Clinton strategy is going to succeed because it's true. Clinton may have an impressively long record of bad judgment calls. She may be almost comically out of step with the populist mood of the moment. She may be widely disliked by an electorate that doesn't trust her. But at least she and her campaign aren't proudly ignorant of public policy. Or prone to spewing misogynistic, racist, anti-Muslim, and anti-Semitic insults. Or wildly and continuously flip-flopping on policy. Or promising to tear up the entire postwar international order. Or threatening to forcibly round up and deport millions of people and ban members of an entire world religion from entering the United States.

With an opponent like Donald Trump, Clinton needs do little more than convey the same simple message day after day: "You may not like me, but at least I'm vastly better, more competent, more knowledgeable, less hateful, less risky, and yes, less corrupt than he is."

Again, it will work because it's true.

Of course, Trump's die-hard fanboys and a subset of Republicans (those for whom every Clinton scandal that fails to land her or her husband in jail is an occasion to recommit to the project of bringing them down once and for all) will never be persuaded. But most voters will be. And that will be enough to get her over the finish line — maybe even by historic margins.

If it wasn't obvious before, it certainly is now: Hillary Clinton is an eminently beatable candidate. Just about any Republican could have brought her down — except for the one the party chose.

#### Every poll has Trump losing by a substantial amount

Vankin 7-1 – Jonathan Vankin, American author and journalist, 2016 (“Hillary Clinton Crushes Donald Trump In New Polls: Zero Chance In Electoral College For Trump, Clinton Leads Battlegrounds”, Inquistr, Available online at <http://www.inquisitr.com/3264862/hillary-clinton-vs-donald-trump-new-polls/>, Accessed on 07-07-2016, KG)

A new set of polls shows Hillary Clinton crushing Donald Trump in a series of crucial swing states for the 2016 presidential election. And in the all-important Electoral College, which under the United States Constitution is the body that will actually decide who becomes the next president, the new polls effectively eliminate the New York businessman from winning the White House. Unless he can do something to turn public opinion around over the next four months, he’s done. According to the election-tracking site Election Graphs which collects state-by-state polling to compile Electoral College outlooks for both candidates, the best-case scenario for the Republican presumptive nominee would leave him with 243 electoral votes — 27 short of the 270 required to win the Electoral College and the presidency, which would then go to Clinton with 295 electoral votes. That “best case” for Trump would mean that he would not only win all states in which he currently holds a lead in polling averages, but he would also need to win the four “weak” Clinton states as well — that is, states in which Hillary Clinton leads by less than five percentage points in polling averages. Those four states are New Hampshire, North Carolina, Ohio, and Nevada. But even if Trump were to sweep those states, he still loses the election in the Electoral College. For more analysis of the most recent state-by-state polling, watch the following video discussion with political commentator Richard French. At the same time, a new projection by political scientist Larry Sabato, whose “Crystal Ball” election forecasting model claims a 99 percent accuracy rate in forecasting state election results, gives an even bigger advantage to Clinton, with 347 electoral votes projected for the Democrat, to 191 for the Republican. The Electoral College system is mandated by the U.S. Constitution, assigning each state one electoral vote for every representative in congress from that state, for a total of 538 votes, including three electoral votes from the District of Columbia. For example, New York has 25 representatives in the House plus, like every state, two U.S. senators — for a total of 27 electoral votes. With the exception of Maine and Nebraska, each state awards its electoral votes on a “winner-take-all” basis, but electors are not legally bound to cast their electoral ballots for any particular candidate regardless of the outcome of the vote in their specific states. However, instances of rogue or, as they are generally called, “faithless” electors have been few and far between. Also few and far between are instances when the winner of the electoral college has not also been the winner of the national popular vote — a situation that has occurred only four times in United States history, and only once since 1888, in the 2000 election which saw Democrat Al Gore win the popular vote but lose the presidency in the electoral college. A series of polls by Ballotpedia this week put Democrat Clinton in front of her Republican rival in seven important swing states — states that have not shown a strong tendency in recent elections to favor either party. With most states apparently locked in for either the Democrat or the Republican, the “battleground states” are the ones that will ultimately decide the election. The Ballotpedia polls showed Clinton leading in Florida, Iowa, Michigan, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Virginia. Of those, only Iowa, with a four-point lead for Clinton, showed the presumptive Democratic nominee leading by under seven points. “The Ballotpedia results look very bad for Trump,” wrote election forecaster Sam Minter of Election Graphs. “All in all, the net result is that once again even if Trump were to win all the states he is ahead in, plus all the states where he is less than 5 percent behind, he would still lose.”

#### Uniqueness overwhelms the link – Trump has no chance in Pennsylvania, while the important swing states don’t contain the demographics their link evidence describes

Palmer 7-1 – Bill Palmer, editor and owner of Daily News Bin, 2016 (“Why the media lies to you about Hillary Clinton’s swing state leads”, Daily News Bin, Available online at <http://www.dailynewsbin.com/opinion/hillary-vs-trump-how-the-media-lies-to-you-about-the-swing-states/25066/>, Accessed on 07-07-2016, KG)

MSNBC confidently declared today that Pennsylvania is a “toss up” in the general election race between Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump, continuing with its months long narrative that the election was going to be decided in the Keystone State one way or the other. It sounds plausible enough, if you don’t know any better. But one look at the polls reveals that Trump hasn’t led in a Pennsylvania general election poll conducted during this entire cycle. Meanwhile cable news continues to largely ignore other states that actually do look like a toss up but don’t fit the narrative. In reality, Hillary’s average lead in Pennsylvania state polls is around six percent. That suggests that it might end up being a close contest, but that it’s not currently in play. In fact the consistently reliable FiveThirtyEight currently gives Hillary a 78% chance of winning Pennsylvania. That’s some toss-up, eh? Instead, the real swing states in this election are elsewhere at the moment. As it turns out, Hillary Clinton currently has a decent sized lead in nearly every state which would traditionally be considered a Presidential swing state. North Carolina is the only close call among the states that are usually in play, where she leads by an average of just two points. And there are no traditional swing states where Trump holds a lead. The actual swing states in this race appear to be Arizona where Trump leads by just a half a point, Missouri where Trump leads by one point, and Georgia where Trump leads by two points. But none of those three fit with the prevailing cable news narrative that this election is going to be decided based on trade deals by people in blue collar states like Pennsylvania, or that it’s going to be competitive in the Electoral Collage. In fact, the minute the media acknowledges that Hillary is leading every blue state and every swing state, while Trump is in real danger of losing three red states, viewers will figure out that the election is basically over unless something huge comes along and unexpectedly changes things. And cable news simply can’t afford to admit that this is not currently a competitive race. If they do, people will decide to tune out for the summer and maybe check back in as election day grows closer. That would be devastating for ratings. And so the media bends over backward to pretend that the traditionally important-sounding Pennsylvania is in play when it really isn’t, while not daring to acknowledge that Pennsylvania won’t matter anyway if Hillary wins these red states that have suddenly turned into swing states. Again, single-state polls are only worth whatever you think they’re worth in terms of reliability at this stage of the election. If you think it’s too early for those polls to be meaningful, then throw them out for now. But if you do decide to pay heed to them, make sure you’re seeing the real picture. On most days you’re simply not going to get that from cable news, which has a vested interest in making sure you think this race is close so you’ll stay tuned in.

#### Clinton win is inevitable – most qualled – empirics go aff – don’t buy their media inflation

Wiener 6/9 – (Jon Wiener is a professor of US history at UC Irvine, has a B.A. from Princeton and a Ph.D. from Harvard; 6/21/16, “﻿ Relax, Donald Trump Can’t Win,” *The Nation*, <https://www.thenation.com/article/trump-cant-win/>, Accessed 7/5/16, HWilson)

﻿It’s hard for people who follow the daily ups and downs of the candidates to accept the fact that voting in America is remarkably stable from election to election. Regardless of who the candidates are, people who voted Republican in the last election almost always vote Republican in the next one, and it’s the same for Democrats. It’s been true for the last five or six presidential elections. And these patterns are amplified by the Electoral College, where only a few states switch from one party to another between elections. Democrats have won the popular vote in five of the last six presidential elections (there was that glitch in 2000 with Bush v. Gore at the Supreme Court). Obama beat John McCain in 2008 by more than 9 million votes. He beat Mitt Romney in 2012 by almost 5 million votes. For Trump to win, he needs all of the people who voted for Romney plus at least 5 million more. And they have to be in the right states—the swing states, especially Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia, North Carolina, and Florida. Where can Trump get those votes?

Trump’s base is the white working class, especially men. But the white working class didn’t vote for Obama—they were Republicans long before Trump arrived on the scene. Obama got only 36 percent of the white working-class vote in 2012—and, among white working-class men, he probably got less than that. The white working-class men who voted for Obama are mostly in secure Democratic states like New York, Illinois, and California. Even if Trump won some of them away from Hillary, it wouldn’t help him in the electoral college.

There undoubtedly were some white working-class voters who didn’t vote at all in 2012 because they were turned off both by Obama and by Romney’s corporate-CEO aura. But will enough of them vote for Trump to change the outcome of the vote in five or six swing states? The experts who count votes say no. People who didn’t vote in the last election are not likely to vote in the next one—that’s part of the stable pattern of American politics.

And Trump seems likely to lose some of the people who voted for Romney—especially some Republican women, turned off by his abusive remarks. Romney got about 45 percent of the female vote. If 3 or 4 percent of Republican women don’t vote for Trump, that would be devastating for him, especially in the swing states. And the polls right now show it could be much worse for him: A NBC/Wall Street Journal poll in March found that 47 percent of Republican female primary voters said they could not imagine themselves voting for Trump. A poll of female voters overall (CNN in March) found that 73 percent had a negative view of Trump.

What about independents—the biggest group in the electorate, people who tell pollsters they are neither Republicans nor Democrats? Political scientists have found very few independents who are actually swing voters; almost all vote consistently for one party. They may like to think of themselves as “independent” of party labels, but in practice almost none of the independents who voted for Obama in 2008 voted for Romney in 2012, and almost none of the independents who voted for McCain in 2008 switched to Obama in 2012. Almost all of the independents who might vote for Trump already have voted Republican in past elections.

What about the new voters, young first-time voters: are several million of them going to vote for Trump? Short answer: no. Young voters and first-time voters are a key Democratic constituency. They are also the least likely age group to vote. The big challenge for the Democrats has been to get this constituency of theirs to register and cast a vote on election day. Instead of trying to recruit young first-time voters, Republican have worked to make it harder for them to register and vote, because they know what young voters are likely to do on Election Day.

But didn’t Trump do really well in the primaries? He got more primary votes than Romney did in 2012. He said he was bringing “millions and millions of new voters” into the Republican party. But polls show his voters in the primaries were almost all committed Republicans. They may have not have voted in earlier primaries, but almost all had voted Republican in general elections in the past. Trump got 13 million votes in the primaries. But Obama got 66 million votes in November 2012. The point is simple: Very few people vote in primary elections. Trump’s success in the spring says nothing about how he will do in the fall. It’s likely that the rhetoric that won him those 13 million votes will turn off millions of other voters he needs if he’s going to win in November.

All this assumes the people who voted for Obama will vote for Hillary, that the historic pattern will hold in 2016. People say “this time it’s different”—because we’ve never had a woman candidate, and sexism is a powerful force in American politics. But we never had a black candidate until 2008, and racism has certainly been a powerful force in American politics. Is there more hostility to women than to blacks in American politics? Right now there are 20 women in the Senate, and only two blacks (Republican Tim Scott from South Carolina, and Democrat Corey Booker from New Jersey). Hillary, we are told, has a “man problem”: One recent poll showed Trump winning among men 49-40 percent. But the same poll showed women choosing Hillary by a larger margin, 51-38 percent. That’s consistent with the historical pattern. Romney won the male vote by 8 points—basically the same as Trump’s lead among men in polls now. It’s way too early to pay a lot of attention to the current polls, but the Trump-Clinton gender gap is likely to be much larger this year than it was for Romney-Obama, and since more women vote than men, the historic Democratic advantage will likely remain.

It’s different this time, we are also told, because the Bernie/Hillary primary fight was so intense. What if some of Bernie’s supporters won’t vote for Hillary? Could the Democratic vote fall by 4 million and give Trump the margin he needs in the swing states? Again, that seems extremely unlikely. In 2008, the people who voted for Hillary in the Democratic primary were very much against Obama when the primaries ended. They regarded him as unqualified. But on election day six months later, almost all ended up voting for him. This fall Bernie will be campaigning against Trump, and Elizabeth Warren will be campaigning against Trump. The long-term patterns suggest that almost all Democrats and Democratic “leaners” will vote for the Democratic candidate again this November.

It’s the job of the news media to make it seem that it’s different this time, so that we need to tune in and keep up. But the political scientists say it’s probably not going to be different this time. Whatever the polls say now (and right now they show Hillary ahead), the long-term patterns of American politics tell us that Trump is not going to get millions more votes than Romney did, and he’s not going to carry enough swing states to overcome the historic pattern of Democratic advantage. Hillary will win in November, and she will be sworn in as our next president on January 20.

### 2AC – AT: Trade Link

#### No link and turn – Americans love trade and it’s not a winning issue for Trump, especially in swing states

New Frontier 6/29 – (The New Frontier, pseudonym for a writer at DailyKos, 6/29/16, “Trade is Not a Winning Issue for Trump,” <http://www.dailykos.com/stories/2016/6/29/1543538/-Trade-is-Not-a-Winning-Issue-for-Trump>, Accessed 7/5/16, HWilson)

In this election cycle, it has become the conventional wisdom that presumptive Republican nominee Donald Trump is uniquely poised to win swing voters and wayward Democrats, due in part to his aggressive support for protectionism. Since last week’s Brexit vote, commentary about an anti-global, protectionist moment has reached a fever pitch, with some pundits speculating that presumptive Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton will be swept away before the protectionist “wave” unless she mimics her opponent and tacks hard to the isolationist camp.

The conventional wisdom is wrong. Available data does not support the notion that this is a protectionist moment, or that the American people strongly favor protectionism. Pew Research finds that 51% of voters favor trade and trade agreements, while 39% oppose them. The situation in swing states is similar: the Hill reports that a PPI poll found 55% of voters across Colorado, Florida, Nevada, and Ohio were favorable toward trade, while only 32% viewed it unfavorably. Drilling down, it becomes even clearer that Trump’s protectionism is not a general election asset: PPI’s poll found that swing state Democrats were more favorable toward trade than the electorate as a whole, with 66% supportive to 25% in opposition. Pew drilled down further, finding that support for trade was strongest among Democratic base constituencies: 72% of Hispanic voters, 55% of African-Americans, 54% of women, and 67% of young voters were supportive. In addition, 56% of Democrats and voters leaning Democratic (including 58% of Clinton voters and 55% of Sanders voters) viewed trade positively. In contrast, opposition to trade was strongest among Republicans, with Trump supporters heavily favoring protectionism while Kasich and Cruz voters were split on the issue.

As to whether this or other issues allows Trump to scramble the electorate, the answer is pretty clearly no: Clinton leads Trump by a similar margin to the one at which Barack Obama led John McCain (a more conventional Republican) at this point in 2008.

To be sure, the question of trade policy is not a black-and-white divide between “trade” and “protectionism,” and this data addresses the political, rather than policy, implications of trade. However, it is clear from the data that protectionism is no more popular than usual outside of the demographics (which Democrats do not and cannot win anyway) where it is always popular. This data tracks closely with my own experience as a resident of southwestern Pennsylvania: the only voters who are aggressively pro-protectionism, and probably the only voters for whom it is truly a “voting issue,” have been beyond the reach of the Democratic Party for decades. The general public, and Democratic base constituencies in particular, are opposed to Trump’s trade-war protectionism.

#### The link wont swing swing voters in swing states

Gerwin and Marshall 6/21 – (Ed Gerwin is a senior fellow for trade and global opportunity at the Progressive Policy Institute; Will Marshall is president and founder of the Progressive Policy Institute (PPI), established in 1989 as a center for political innovation in Washington, D.C.; 6/21/16, “Trump's Wrong on Trade Policy & Maybe Trade Politics, Too,” *Real Clear Policy*, <http://www.realclearpolicy.com/articles/2016/06/21/trumps_wrong_on_trade_policy__maybe_trade_politics_too.html>, Accessed 7/5/16, HWilson)

The Washington Post’s Catherine Rampell recently detailed the economic carnage that would result from Donald Trump’s reckless approach to trade — including likely recessions, millions of lost jobs, and higher prices for American consumers.

As we’ve detailed, protectionism is bad economics. But, apparently, it’s been good politics for Trump as well as Bernie Sanders, both of whom used trade-bashing populism to energize angry voters during primary elections, where extreme partisans often play an outsized role. And Trump promises to double down on opposition to trade as he pivots toward November.

As America moves from interminable primaries to the general election, however, Trump — and Hillary Clinton — will face a different political calculus on trade. A new Progressive Policy Institute poll shows that Democratic voters in key battleground states have a broadly positive view on trade — and a more positive one than do Republicans. Crucially, so do the swing voters, who will ultimately determine whether these states go red or blue in November.

Swing voters and voters in battleground states played a decisive role in reelecting Barack Obama in 2012 — and in sending a large Republican majority to Congress in 2014. As detailed in our new poll, conducted by veteran Democratic pollster Peter Brodnitz, these voters also have decidedly different attitudes about trade and America’s role in the global economy.

Our survey of voter attitudes in the battleground states of Colorado, Florida, Nevada, and Ohio found that most voters believe that improving the economy should be America’s key priority. While few are angry, most rate the economy as only “fair” or “poor.” Swing voters, in particular, tend to be more worried about the economy than Democrats and are especially focused on pragmatic solutions to promote economic growth and competitiveness.

On trade and global competitiveness, specifically, our survey underscores three critical findings.

1. Battleground voters don’t buy the protectionist claim that America can prosper by walling itself off from the global economy.

Instead, these voters want America to step up its global game. 75 percent (including 73 percent of swing voters and 82 percent of Democrats) believe that to have a strong economy, America must “rely heavily on trade with other countries.” Additionally, almost all battleground voters — 90 percent — believe it’s important to create an environment that enables American companies to compete against foreign businesses, and a strong majority believe that workers can and should benefit from company success.

2. Swing state voters understand that American companies and workers face strong competition in a complex global economy — and that there are no simple solutions.

Voters are concerned, for example, about the threat of U.S. manufacturing jobs moving overseas. Two-thirds of battleground voters (and 72 percent of Democrats) believe this threat comes primarily from greater competition from foreign industries and workers, rather than from the “bad trade agreements” that trade opponents like Trump and Sanders often cite.

Similarly, when asked to choose among policies to keep jobs in America, 67 percent of battleground voters chose either lowering corporate tax rates or educating more highly skilled workers; only 19 percent believed that ending trade agreements was the solution. And, more generally, over 85 percent of battleground voters believe that higher levels of education and training and increased investment in infrastructure are keys to advancing the U.S. economy.

3. Battleground voters believe that high-standard trade deals help the American economy and support good jobs.

Three-quarters of swing state voters believe that trade agreements are “important” in boosting the greater reliance on trade that they see as vital for a strong U.S. economy. When asked to evaluate trade agreements with strong labor and environmental standards, 55 percent of swing state voters said they believe these agreements can help the economy and create good paying jobs; only 32 percent felt that the costs of high-standard deals outweigh the benefits. Notably, Democrats were especially supportive — by a margin of 66 to 25 percent.

Our poll’s findings suggest that to prevail with swing voters and in swing states, Democrats, in particular, will need to craft messages and support policies that transcend protectionism — that recognize trade’s role in supporting American prosperity, acknowledge the complexity of global competition, and highlight the benefits of high-standard trade agreements.

If done right, this can be both smart politics and sound policy.

#### Trump’s anti-trade strategy will fail – can’t compensate for other voters that he’ll alienate

Economist 7-2 – The Economist, 2016 (“Rustproofing”, Available online at <http://www.economist.com/news/united-states/21701486-can-donald-trump-flip-old-manufacturing-regions-midwest-rustproofing>, Accessed on 07-07-2016, KG)

“MANY Pennsylvania towns once thriving and humming are now in a state of despair,” said Donald Trump in “Declaring America’s Economic Independence”, a speech he made on June 28th about jobs and the evils of free trade. This wave of globalisation has wiped out the middle class, claimed the presumptive Republican nominee for the presidency, tagging NAFTA “the worst trade deal in history”, and blaming China’s entrance into the World Trade Organisation for “the greatest jobs theft in history”. But it doesn’t have to be that way, he reassured his audience, for he alone can turn things round. It was no coincidence that Mr Trump chose a Pennsylvania-based company, Alumisource, as the site for his speech, which the frequently unscripted candidate read from a teleprompter, using quotations from Washington, Hamilton and Lincoln and providing no fewer than 128 footnotes for the curious. Winning the rustbelt, especially in Ohio and western Pennsylvania, is central to his 15-state strategy, announced at the end of last month. In the evening of June 28th Mr Trump spoke at a rally at Ohio State University in St Clairsville. The Midwest matters so much to Mr Trump because his candidacy has repeatedly upended conventional wisdom. Before the primaries, most elected Republicans were sure the party needed to nominate someone palatable to Hispanic voters. Mr Trump’s proposed wall to deter Mexicans has put habitual swing-states such as Colorado off limits and made Florida, which has plenty of Hispanic voters, look like hostile territory too. To compensate for this, he needs to take back states in the Midwest and north-east that Barack Obama won in 2012. How likely is it that Mr Trump can win over America’s heartland? Places like Elkhart, a town of 50,000 in northern Indiana, explain why Mr Trump’s campaign thinks the Midwest is such friendly turf. Elkhart used to be one of the hardest-hit of the many down-on-their-luck midwestern manufacturing towns. The town lost 24,000 jobs when the recession struck, and unemployment shot up to more than 20% of the workforce. One of the biggest makers of recreational vehicles, Elkhart proudly calls itself the “RV capital of the world”. But its overreliance on one industry making a non-essential product means business dries up very quickly during an economic downturn. Mr Obama’s first trip to the Midwest after he was elected was to Elkhart, which he intended to make a showcase for his $800 billion stimulus package. He returned several times in subsequent years. On the face of it, his plan worked like a charm. When he visited again at the beginning of June, to take stock of Elkhart’s economic progress, he found that unemployment stood at just 4.1%, high-school graduation rates had jumped to 88% and the rate of mortgages that were late or about to foreclose had fallen by more than half, to 3.7%. “Today we could easily use another 15,000 workers in the county,” says Mark Dobson of the Economic Development Corporation of Elkhart County. And yet Elkharters, who in the primaries voted in droves for Mr Trump and for Bernie Sanders, the other insurgent candidate, give Mr Obama scant credit for the turnaround. “President Obama had nothing to do with our recovery,” says Kyle Hannon of the Greater Elkhart Chamber of Commerce. He admits that the stimulus funds helped to improve infrastructure and were good for local building companies, but insists “We did it ourselves” when referring to the recovery of the RV industry, which had record sales in 2015 and is expecting another sterling year in 2016. Many Elkharters still find it frustratingly hard to make ends meet, which may explain their penchant for Mr Trump. Plenty of jobs are available now, but many are poorly paid or part-time. An analysis by the Pew Research Centre found that the median household income of Elkharters has dropped by 10%, from $76,000 a year in 2008 to $68,000 in 2014 (see chart). Even more startling is that median income was $78,000 in 1999, which means that incomes have fallen considerably throughout the new century. (Sixty-one percent of local households are middle-income, compared with 51% nationwide.) Indiana, of which Elkhart is part, begins 2016 in the Republican column (Mitt Romney won the state in 2012). Mr Trump’s midwestern strategy depends on winning all such states in the region (the Dakotas, Nebraska, Kansas and Missouri) and then adding some combination of Ohio, Iowa and Michigan. The latter seems like a stretch: Michigan last voted for a Republican presidential candidate in 1988. To make the plan work, says Henry Olsen at the Ethics and Public Policy Centre, a conservative think-tank, Mr Trump would have to take almost all the Romney vote and around 5% of the Obama vote in the Midwest. Mr Trump’s message blasting international trade, illegal immigration and corporate outsourcing go down well in the rustbelt bits of the Midwest, which are on average whiter, less educated and older than the rest of the country—and are still smarting from the loss of 6m manufacturing jobs between 2000 and 2009. “The era of economic surrender will finally be over,” promised Mr Trump, vowing to renegotiate NAFTA and to withdraw America from the Trans-Pacific Partnership, a trade deal still in the making. The plan has three flaws. First, peeling off blue-collar Democratic voters would not on its own be enough if, in so doing, Mr Trump alienates Republicans in the suburbs of midwestern cities who voted for Mr Romney. Second, blue-collar workers of Anglo-Saxon, Italian and eastern European origin in, say, Michigan and Pennsylvania take to Mr Trump much more than those of Scandinavian or German extraction, who are the majority in Minnesota and Wisconsin. Third, the Midwest and the rustbelt are not one and the same. And Mr Trump’s strength in the region is likely to run through the rustbelt, whose centre lies farther to the east. Mr Trump may win Pennsylvania, with its 20 electoral-college votes, but he may also waste votes in those bits of the rustbelt attached to states that lean strongly Democratic: polls put Hillary Clinton up by 20 points in New York. Even if he is ultimately unsuccessful, Mr Trump’s rustbelt rhetoric will affect the sort of campaign his Democratic rival runs. Rather than explain the ways in which the Midwest benefits from trade, Mrs Clinton, who was in Indiana on June 26th and then went on to Ohio and Illinois on June 27th, delighted in pointing out that Trump furniture is made in Turkey, instead of Cleveland, Ohio, and that Trump barware is made in Slovenia, instead of Toledo, Ohio. This is good politics, but it makes a gloomy spectacle for those who think trade makes America, and the world, richer.

#### Link is non-unique and empirically denied – Trump’s anti-trade rhetoric in Pennsylvania has failed to get more voters after a year of campaigning

Morrissey 7-5 – Ed Morrissey, American conservative blogger, columnist , motivational speaker, and talk show host, 2016 (“Can Trump win Pennsylvania?”, Hot Air, Available online at <http://hotair.com/archives/2016/07/05/can-trump-win-pennsylvania/>, Accessed on 07-07-2016, KG)

Can Donald Trump find the key to unlock the Keystone State? To win the White House, supporters and detractors of Trump both agree, the presumptive Republican nominee will have to redraw the Electoral College map. Trump has embraced a more protectionist policy on trade than either Republicans and Democrats have for decades in an attempt to woo despairing working-class voters back to the ballot box. Ground Zero for that strategy seems to be Pennsylvania, and it may well have its intended effect, Salena Zito reports for the Pittsburgh Tribune-Review: Western Pennsylvania has been the driving force in the state becoming more Republican said Henry Olsen, a Senior Fellow at the Ethics and Public Policy Center. Olsen said voting patterns of former union Democrats displaced by trade deals and environmental regulations that impacted the coal industry contributed to the rightward push. “If you look at the coal county of Greene, the person who is not looking closely says, ‘Oh well, Romney carried it by huge margins, so how can that make a difference for Trump?’ Well he did, except potential turnout was down by 10 percentage points,” Olson said. “If Trump gets that 10 percent back, that is only 1,500 to 2,000 votes in a small county like Greene, but then you get an extra 10 percent in Washington, Cambria, Indiana, Somerset counties, which have larger populations,” he said of neighboring counties with similar voting patterns. “Then, all of a sudden, you are talking about an extra 200,000 votes; you have to look at turnout and margin as much as who carries it,” he said. It’s not just the western part of the state where the hard line on trade will resonate, either: “The same goes for the Philly collar county of Bucks,” Wasserman said, as well as the northeastern coal counties of Luzerne and Lackawanna, “where Trump won’t necessarily win, but could chip away at Clinton’s margins.” The potential has Team Hillary worried, the Washington Post reports, especially in regard to the rank-and-file within the trade unions: Of the many ways Trump, the GOP’s presumptive presidential nominee, has scrambled the 2016 campaign, it is his position on trade that has presented one of the most unexpected challenges for his rival, Hillary Clinton, the likely Democratic nominee. In an election season animated by economic anxiety, Trump, a New York business mogul, bucked Republican orthodoxy and powerful business interests such as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce in an appeal to blue-collar Republicans that helped propel him t o victory inthe GOP primaries. Clinton, who scrambled to move left on trade during her tough primary fight against Sen. Bernie Sanders of Vermont, now finds herself again facing attacks on the issue — this time from Trump. He used his Pittsburgh-area speech to disparage her association with a pair of major trade agreements — one negotiated by President Bill Clinton’s administration and the other by President Obama’s while she served as secretary of state. For Hillary Clinton, the risk is not necessarily losing support directly to Trump but rather not inspiring enough enthusiasm among rank-and-file union workers, whose turnout and ground-level organizing have traditionally been crucial for Democrats. Clinton already has the endorsements of several of the nation’s largest labor organizations, including the AFL-CIO and the United Auto Workers, but faces the question of whether that organized support will be enough to hold the labor voting bloc together at a time when Trump has co-opted the traditional labor message about the perils of free trade and globalization. Theoretically, it’s possible. However, there doesn’t seem to be much evidence so far that it’s working — not in Pennsylvania, and not in neighboring Ohio, where Republicans have a smaller hurdle to clear. Four polls since mid-May show Trump slightly trailing Hillary in Ohio, with one Quinnipiac poll showing a tie — at 40% each. A previous Quinnipiac poll in April showed Trump with a four-point lead, and a February poll had Trump up two, but Quinnipiac is the only pollster in the RCP aggregate to show Trump up in the state at all. At the moment, Hillary has a 2.5-point lead in the RCP average for the Buckeye State. A very similar dynamic shows up in the aggregate polling for Pennsylvania. In fact, the RCP average is almost identical — 2.3 points for Hillary. The only poll to ever show Trump in the lead for this state came from Democratic pollster PPP, and that was in October. At the beginning of June, PPP had the two in a 44-all tie, but their latest poll now shows Hillary with a four-point lead. Given that Trump has sounded the protectionist bell for almost a year, one would have expected to see a response by now in polling if this kind of response would be forthcoming. So far, it doesn’t appear to be materializing. It could be that pollsters are missing this eruption of populist-protectionist fervor, but they largely got it right in the Republican primaries, accurately heralding Trump’s domination. Bear in mind that Pennsylvania wasn’t a narrow loss in 2012, either. Barack Obama beat Mitt Romney by five points and 310,000 votes, so it would either take 155,000+ votes to change parties, an additional 311,000 votes apart from the 2012 turnout, or a combination of both. That’s a lot of votes to flip, especially for a campaign that has until recently seemed very uninterested in the kind of ground campaign needed to make it happen. In comparison, the gap in Ohio is about half of that — three points and 166,000 votes. That kind of movement should be showing up in some polling if it’s going to happen, but it’s not coming up in any series at the moment. That doesn’t mean it won’t happen, of course. It’s a long campaign, with lots of unknowns ahead of us. So far, though, there’s not much reason to conclude that Pennsylvania is in serious play — and without it, the path to 270 Electoral College votes looks theoretical rather than practical at the moment.

## \*\*\*SPECIFIC STATES\*\*\*

## Florida

### 2AC – Florida – Demographics

#### Trump won’t win – Hispanic population is increasing

Klas 7/2 – (MARY ELLEN KLAS, writer for the Miami Herald/Times Tallahassee Bureau, 7/2/16, “Hispanic growth in Florida: Will it determine the election?,” *Miami Herald*, <http://www.miamiherald.com/news/politics-government/state-politics/article87250257.html>, Accessed 7/5/16, HWilson)

What difference does four years make? For Florida, in a presidential election year, the difference means surging population growth that could influence the outcome of the national contest.

The state remains a crucial swing state in the presidential sweepstakes but, since 2012, Florida’s electorate has changed in important ways — exacerbating the role of its growing Hispanic and elderly populations and potentially sowing seeds of a more disruptive revolution to come.

The generational and ideological tensions that could emerge between the aging baby boomers, who data shows have become more conservative and less trusting of government, and Florida’s increasingly diverse younger generations have the potential to make Florida a bellwether for the nation — again.

New population data released by the U.S. Census bureau June 23 shows that the state grew by 1.46 million people from 2010 to 2015. Looking at ethnicity, Hispanics represent 51 percent of the growth. Looking at age groups, people 65 and older represent 46 percent of the growth. In five years, Florida’s Hispanic population grew 18 percent overall — six times more than non-Hispanic whites, and more than twice as fast as blacks.

More than a third of the growth — 269,911 people — occurred in Miami-Dade and Broward counties, the epicenter of the state’s Hispanic population. But the fastest growth occurred in the counties along the I-4 corridor from Orange, Osceola and Seminole counties to Polk and Hillsborough, which saw its Hispanic population rise by a combined total of 219,229.

The Hispanic population also grew in counties with previously less dense populations. St. John’s County, the bedroom community south of Jacksonville where the $65,575 median income is the highest in the state, saw a 42 percent increase in its Hispanic population. Nearly 4,400 more Hispanics are now living there. Nearby Clay County had a 32 percent increase in Hispanic residents, with 4,876 more newcomers.

And in Florida’s Panhandle, home to three military bases, Santa Rosa, Okaloosa and Bay counties saw increases in their Hispanic residents of between 39 percent to 34 percent between 2010 and 2015.

But to pollsters and political observers, the focus is on the potential impact of these demographic shifts in the November election.

## North Carolina

### 2AC – UQ – Trump win

#### Non-unique – Trump winning in North Carolina now – voters prioritize the economy

Swoyer 7-5 – Alex Swoyer, staff writer at Breitbart News, 2016 (“North Carolina: Trump Outpolls Clinton on Key Issues”, Breitbart, Available online at <http://www.breitbart.com/2016-presidential-race/2016/07/05/north-carolina-boads-well-trump-clinton-top-issues/>, Accessed on 07-07-2016, KG)

As both presumptive Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton and presumptive Republican nominee Donald Trump hold campaign events in the swing state of North Carolina on Tuesday, an analysis of the top election issues facing North Carolina voters suggests Trump is an early favorite in the tar heel state. According to 2012 presidential election exit polls in which Republican nominee Mitt Romney pulled off a tight victory over President Obama in North Carolina, voters cared the most about the economy, the federal budget deficit, foreign policy, and healthcare. Of those issues, voters favored Romney overwhelmingly on the economy, federal budget deficit, and foreign policy. If history repeats itself and those top issues are also the major concerns for North Carolina voters in the 2016 general election, it will bode well for Trump, according to several recent polls. A number of surveys in North Carolina suggest voters found the top issues for the 2016 election are education, jobs, and the economy. For example, a recent survey of 1,530 voters conducted by Elon University found North Carolina voters are most concerned with education. Jobs and wages came in second, followed by the economy as the third top issue. A new national Morning Consult poll published last week found that voters favor Trump on the issues of both job creation and the economy — even though Clinton held a slight lead in the head-to-head matchup. According to the results, 45 percent of voters believe Trump will grow the economy. Only 38 percent believe Clinton can help grow the economy. Additionally, the poll found 43 percent of the voters believe Trump will create more jobs, but only 38 percent favor Clinton on job creation. Furthermore, on the issue of jobs, a recent Public Policy poll found that North Carolina voters disapprove of President Obama — who is campaigning with Clinton in North Carolina — on job performance. A WRAL News poll, the NBC affiliate in Raleigh, North Carolina, also found that 56 percent of North Carolina voters disapprove of how Obama is handling the Islamic State (ISIS) and 34 percent of voters want Obamacare repealed — a promise Trump has made on the campaign trail.

## Ohio

### 2AC – Uniqueness overwhelms

#### Clinton will easily win Ohio – her campaign is more organized and actually on the ground – without Ohio, Trump loses it all

Easley 6-20 – Jason Easley, Senior White House and Congressional correspondent for PoliticusUSA, Publisher, Editor and Founder of PoliticusUSA, 2016 (“Hillary Clinton Is Blowing Out Trump On The Ground In Ohio And It’s Not Even Close”, PoliticusUSA, Available online at <http://www.politicususa.com/2016/06/20/hillary-clinton-blowing-trump-ground-ohio-close.html>, Accessed on 07-07-2016, KG)

Hillary Clinton is organizing and campaigning heavily in swing states. What’s happening on the ground in Ohio is a perfect example of how Clinton is organizing to win the White House from the ground up. Henry Gomez of The Cleveland Plain Dealer reported on the state of the presidential race in Ohio: Yet Trump is poorly organized in this region – he’s not particularly well organized anywhere – and hasn’t visited the Buckeye State since March. Conversely, Clinton’s stop Tuesday will be her second in eight days. …. Democrats say they now have 150 full-time employees on the ground in Ohio. It’s a mix of Ohio Democratic Party and Democratic National Committee staff. In the weeks since Clinton locked up the nomination, all factions appear to be working harmoniously toward her election and toward the election of Ted Strickland, who is challenging Republican Sen. Rob Portman. …. The Republican National Committee has more than 50 paid employees on the ground in the state – less than what was expected by this point. And Trump is still relying on the same in-state personnel that guided him to a loss against Kasich in the state’s March primary. Donald Trump isn’t even trying to compete in Ohio. Hillary Clinton is already out organizing Trump in swing states across the country, but what is happening in Ohio is dramatic because Republicans know that it will be impossible for them to win the White House if Hillary Clinton carries Ohio. Trump is making the Republican Party run his campaign for him, and at a time when he should have been building his organization on the ground, the presumptive Republican nominee is firing his campaign manager and off to Scotland to handle “personal business.” Hillary Clinton is building a formidable organization for November, and Donald Trump doesn’t seem to care. Trump is laying the groundwork for defeat. Television interviews can’t replace boots on the ground in swing states. If Hillary Clinton wins Ohio in November, it will be because she trounced Trump in the Buckeye State by laying the foundation for victory all summer long.

## Pennsylvania

### 2AC – Non-unique – PA

#### Non-unique – Trump can win Pennsylvania in the status quo

Zito 7-6 – Salena Zito, Pittsburgh Tribune-Review editorial page columnist, 2016 (“Trump Victory in Pennsylvania Hinges on 10 Counties, Experts Say”, RealClearPolitics, Available online at <http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2016/07/06/trump_victory_in_pennsylvania_hinges_on_10_counties_experts_say_131111.html>, Accessed on 07-07-2016, KG)

Republicans may not be committing political hyperbole this year when they say their presidential candidate can win Pennsylvania, experts say. Every election since Pennsylvania went for Bill Clinton in 1992, Republicans have declared “this time” the Keystone State will turn red. And every cycle they fail. This year might be different, according to experts in electoral math. “Republicans don't need Pennsylvania to win the electoral vote, but Democrats do, and a loss here for Hillary Clinton on election night would likely mean she loses the White House by the morning,” said Lara Brown, director of George Washington University's political management program. The key to presumptive GOP nominee Donald Trump's winning Pennsylvania in November lies in just 10 counties, the experts say. And it all comes down to tweaking the margins in existing red counties rather than flipping traditionally blue counties. In 2012, Mitt Romney lost to Barack Obama by 309,840 votes. But add a couple of thousand votes in 10 or so counties, and all of a sudden the race gets close. THE WIDE VIEW Dave Wasserman, political analyst at the Cook Political report, crunched Pennsylvania's electoral trends since 1996 and concludes the Keystone State could be the tipping point this cycle for the Republicans. Pennsylvania has become 0.4 percent more Republican every cycle, Wasserman said. In 1996, 28 of Pennsylvania's 67 counties went for Bill Clinton over Bob Dole; by 2012, just 11 counties went for Barack Obama over Mitt Romney. Western Pennsylvania has been the driving force in the state becoming more Republican said Henry Olsen, a Senior Fellow at the Ethics and Public Policy Center. Olsen said voting patterns of former union Democrats displaced by trade deals and environmental regulations that impacted the coal industry contributed to the rightward push. “If you look at the coal county of Greene, the person who is not looking closely says, ‘Oh well, Romney carried it by huge margins, so how can that make a difference for Trump?' Well he did, except potential turnout was down by 10 percentage points,” Olson said. “If Trump gets that 10 percent back, that is only 1,500 to 2,000 votes in a small county like Greene, but then you get an extra 10 percent in Washington, Cambria, Indiana, Somerset counties, which have larger populations,” he said of neighboring counties with similar voting patterns. “Then, all of a sudden, you are talking about an extra 200,000 votes; you have to look at turnout and margin as much as who carries it,” he said. That math does not apply to Western Pennsylvania exclusively. “The same goes for the Philly collar county of Bucks,” Wasserman said, as well as the northeastern coal counties of Luzerne and Lackawanna, “where Trump won't necessarily win, but could chip away at Clinton's margins.” Wasserman said while the suburban counties of Pittsburgh neither resemble nor are as populous as the suburban counties of Philadelphia, “Philly's collar counties are not as blue as you would suspect, and Pittsburgh's collar counties need to have a larger turnout to make the difference.” Trump's performance in the Republican primary was remarkably strong. He swept all 67 counties. That popularity did not appear to abate even after nearly a month of public relations stumbles and bad press, including Trump's comments on an Indiana judge's ethnic background and apparent self-absorption in the aftermath of the Orlando massacre. A Quinnipiac University poll showed Trump remained tied with Democrat Hillary Clinton in Pennsylvania at the end of June. Sean Trende, election analyst at RealClearPolitics, said Clinton must strongly outperform Obama's 2012 numbers in Dauphin, Chester and Lancaster to win. Wasserman, Olson and Kyle Kondik at the University of Virginia's Crystal Ball agreed. In 2012, Obama won Dauphin by 7,000 votes but won Chester by only 500 ballots. He lost Lancaster by 50,000 votes.